XIII. 16

Report of the Legal Remembrancer to Government, North-Western Provinces and Oudh for the year ending 30th Sept, 1892

Subj. — Judicial administration / report / N.W.P and Oudh.

WEST BENGAL SECRETARIAT LIBRARY

BENGAL SECRETARIAT LIBRARY

REPORT

OF THE

LEGAL REMEMBRANCER TO GOVERNMENT,

NORTH-WESTERN PROVINCES AND OUDH,

For the year ending 30th September 1892.

No. $\frac{2262}{508}$ OF 1893.

FROM

THE HON'BLE L. M. THORNTON, C.S.,

OFFG. LEGAL REMEMBRANCER TO GOVT., N.-W. P. AND OUDH,

TO

THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

NORTH-WESTERN PROVINCES AND OUDH.

DATED ALLAHABAD, THE 15TH MARCH 1893.

SIR,

I HAVE the honor to submit, for the information of His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, North-Western Provinces, and Chief Commissioner of Oudh, the annual report and the returns showing the litigation to which the Secretary of State, Municipal Boards, and Court of Wards were parties during the year ending 30th September 1892. I succeeded the Hon'ble Mr. Deas in the office of Legal Remembrancer after the close of the year under report, *viz.*, on the 29th December 1892.

2. The total number of cases of all kinds before the Courts was 529 (against 602 in the previous year). Of these 81, or less than 16 per cent., resulted in unfavourable decisions. The total number of cases decided was 313: and of these decisions 81, or 26 per cent., were adverse to the State, Municipal Boards, or Court of Wards, while 21 cases were compromised or withdrawn. In the previous year the percentage of cases lost on the number decided was 21 per cent. The majority of cases fell in the following three classes, *viz.*, (1) to recover money or property due under a contract; (2) for declaration of right to, or for possession of, real property; and (3) applications for execution of decrees.

APPENDIX A.

STATE LITIGATION.

3. *Statement I.—Civil suits and applications in Courts of first instance.*—The State was a party to 87 cases and applications in the Courts of first instance—against 134 in the previous year—being plaintiff in 28 and defendant in 59.

4. Of the 28 claims which it was thought expedient for the Government to prosecute, six are still pending: and of those decided, 13 were successful, none were compromised (three, however, were withdrawn), and in six the claims of Government were rejected by the Court. Subtracting the value (Rs. 3,135-10-7½) of claims pending from the total value of claims, the value dealt with was Rs. 28,406-7-10½. The amount decreed was Rs. 11,168, being a percentage of 39 as against 22 per cent. in the preceding year.

5. Out of the 59 claims brought against Government, 23 are still awaiting decision. Five were withdrawn and compromised, and of the remainder 10 were decreed against the State.

6. The value of the claims decreed in the 36 decided cases in which the State was defendant was only Rs. 13,623-7-0, out of Rs. 52,764-13-7 which represented the sum of the original claims in these cases.

7. The following are the particulars of the cases (excluding miscellaneous applications, applications for execution of decrees, and references under the Land Acquisition Act) which were decided adversely to Government :—

(1) *Kuar Man Singh* versus *Bakhshi, others, and Secretary of State* (*Aligarh*).—In this case the Secretary of State was made a co-defendant merely because the suit was on a mortgage, and the mortgaged property had been afterwards hypothecated as security for two kurk amíns in Government service. Government was called on by plaintiff to admit the genuineness of the original mortgage deed. The deed in question being a genuine document, its genuineness was admitted; and fresh security was required from the kurk amíns.

(2) *Alim-ulla* versus *Secretary of State* (*Agra*).—This was a suit to recover possession of 142 square yards of land, which plaintiff stated the Government had wrongly leased as nazúl in 1887. The Munsif held that the contention of Government, that the land had been nazúl since 1870, was not sufficiently proved by officials as against plaintiff's evidence both oral and documentary. A portion of the claim, which was for damages for removal of bricks, was dismissed. The local officers urged an appeal, which resulted in a remand of the case, but eventually the appeal was dismissed on 26th January 1893.

(3) *Rúnis of Landhaura* versus *Secretary of State* (*Bijnor*).—This was an important case. The origin of it was an order passed by Mr. Markham as Collector in March 1887, when the demarcation of the Government Forest of Chandi was about to include the "Nauwala Islands" in the river Ganges. To this the Landhaura Estate objected, but Mr. Markham threw out their contention that the islands really belonged to their village of Bhogpur on the opposite side. This suit was accordingly instituted after notice being given in 1888. The Forest Department requested that the action might be defended: and the Hon'ble Mr. Knox gave his assent upon information supplied, as to which it seems possible that there was some misunderstanding The suit was roughly for about 1,000 bighas *pukhta*, valued at Rs. 12,150, of which sum, however, Rs. 5,149 was estimated value of standing timber. In dealing with the case, the Subordinate Judge of Moradabad issued a commission to Mr. Sparke, Head Drawing Master of the Roorkee College, to verify maps of the locality. This was done (before two Forest Officers) in December 1891, when it was found that the deep-stream of the Ganges had shifted eastward again and was then flowing through the centre of the "Nauwála Islands." Mr. Sparke reported in favour of the contention that the disputed land had originally lain wholly west of the Ganges and belonged to the Landhaura Estate. There was no sufficient proof, in the Court's opinion, of the Government's holding possession (as had been alleged) since 1838: and, on the other hand, there was a fair body of evidence of the plaintiffs' possession. The Subordinate Judge decreed the claim on the 27th July 1892. The Legal Remembrancer, after consulting the Collector of Bijnor and the Government Pleader, High Court, did not recommend an appeal (*vide* this office No. $\frac{634}{900}$, dated 21st November 1892).

(4) *Shakaltip Singh and others* versus *Secretary of State* (*Ballia*).—This suit was brought by plaintiffs to recover Rs. 291-2-1, arrears of Government revenue, which they had been compelled to pay on a *mahal* other than their own, the *mahals* being separately assessed to revenue. The Government contended that as mortgagees of the *sir* lands in the defaulting *mahál* they were responsible for the Government revenue. The Munsif decreed the plaintiffs' claim: and the Subordinate Judge upheld the order, ruling that the plaintiffs were not mortgagees of the *sir* lands and would not be liable for the Government revenue if they were. An appeal to the High Court was not recommended by Legal Remembrancer, and the Government (G. O. No. 2710, dated 19th October 1892), accepted the opinion.

(5) *Kanhai Lal* versus *Secretary of State* (*Lucknow*).—This was a suit to recover proprietary possession of a compound, and for Rs. 17 damages. The plaint stated

that the Government officers sold the land wrongly taking it to be *nazúl*, and thus dispossessed plaintiff of his compound and of some bricks which he had placed there. The evidence, oral and documentary, produced by the plaintiff satisfied the Munsif, who decreed possession of the compound though not the bricks. An appeal was filed on the ground that no acquisition of ownership was proved subsequent to the confiscation of the soil of Lucknow at the Mutiny. The appeal is pending.

(6) *Ram Dat* versus *Secretary of State* (*Bahraich*).—This case was one relating to Forest Laws. The plaintiff in April 1889 purchased seven logs of *sakhu* wood (alleged to be from a Nepal forest) from one Gajadhar and paid Rs. 112 for them. He removed four logs, but three (valued at Rs. 56) were detained, when passing through the Government forest at the border, by the Forest Department authorities, as, in the absence of a mark on the wood, and of a regular pass, the wood was presumed to be Government property. The Munsif on going through the case found that a paper had been given in Nepal to plaintiff which established that he legitimately got possession of the timber. The Munsif accordingly decreed plaintiff's claim to the wood or its value, but, as the pass was not in order, allowed Government its costs from plaintiff and the vendor. An appeal by plaintiff and objection by Government (a separate appeal was negatived in G. O. No. $\frac{358T.}{420A\text{-}2}$, dated 4th May 1892) are pending in the district Appellate Court.

(7) *Sital Prasad* versus *Secretary of State* (*Gorakhpur*).—This was also a case relating to forests. The plaintiff alleged that between his land and that of the Government there is a *nála*, and that half of this is included within his boundary and half within that of Government, and that the deep-stream is the boundary between the lands of the two parties. In the settlement of 1888 the whole of the *nála*, and a considerable amount of land besides, were included in the Government forests. The claim was for possession of half the *nála* and the above-mentioned land, and for Rs. 8,500 on account of mesne profits. Records and maps were examined and the locality was inspected by the Court, and in its opinion the evidence proved that the land in dispute was plaintiff's property. The Subordinate Judge accordingly passed a decree for possession and Rs. 500 mesne profits. An appeal filed is pending in the High Court.

8. The State was thus a party to 58 suits and applications disposed of during the year. Of these, 34 were decided in favour of the State, three were compromised, five withdrawn, and in 16 the State was "unsuccessful." Of these 16, 4 were references to the District Judge under the Land Acquisition Act, and five were miscellaneous applications. The remaining seven cases have been accounted for above. Subjoined is an explanation of those of the cases compromised or withdrawn which call for remark :—

(1) *Musammat Lachhminia* versus *Secretary of State* (*Benares*).—This was a claim by a creditor of the deceased, brought against the Secretary of State for the value of the effects of one Raghunath Singh, who died in hospital and whose property was taken over by the State in the absence of heirs. The Legal Remembrancer considered the claim valid and recommended that it be compromised, which was done.

(2) *Secretary of State* versus *Musammat Dulma* (*Benares*).—This was a reference under Act X of 1870 to the District Judge, Benares, relating to a claim made by the defendant for compensation for a plot of land acquired for the Dufferin Hospital. The Collector, considering the reference unnecessary, withdrew it.

(3) *Secretary of State* versus *Kulsum Bibi* (*Benares*).—This was an objection filed on behalf of the State in the case Kulsam Bibi, decree-holder, *versus* Humayun Sultán Begam, judgment-debtor. The suit had resulted in the attachment of a certain house and land in the suburbs of the city of Benares, which had been originally confiscated from Rája Chet Singh and made over for residence to certain members of the Delhi Royal Family. The State interfered on the ground that the house and land was Government property and not liable to sale in execution of decree against private persons. The decree having been satisfied without such sale, the objection was withdrawn as unneeded.

(4) *Collector* versus *Ram Charan* (*Benares*).—This was a reference by the Collector to the Civil Court respecting land acquired for the Benares water works. The reference was withdrawn as the defendant accepted the Collector's award.

(5) *Khalil-ul Rahman and others* versus *Secretary of State* (*Kheri*).—This was a claim for timber against the Forest Department. The case was compromised under the orders of Government (G. O. No. $\frac{760F.}{326A-5}$, dated 15th October 1891).

9. *Statement II.—Cases in District Courts of Appeal.*—Twenty-two suits were carried in appeal to the District Courts. Four appeals were preferred by the Secretary of State, and 18 by the opposite party. The total number of appeals in the previous year was 18. Of the four suits in 1891-92 in which Secretary of State was appellant, two are still pending, and in two the State was unsuccessful. Of the 18 cases in which the Secretary of State was respondent, 11 were decided, *viz.*, 10 favourably and one adversely to the State, and seven are still pending decision.

10. The following are the particulars of the appeals decided against the State:—

(1) *Secretary of State, defendant-appellant,* versus *Shakaldip Singh, plaintiff-respondent* (*Ballia*).—This case has been noticed in paragraph 7 (4).

(2) *Secretary of State, plaintiff-appellant,* versus *Musammat Munder, tawaif, defendant-respondent* (*Gonda*).—The suit was for possession of a plot of *nazúl* land. The appellant contended that the respondent had taken possession of a larger area in Gonda than she was entitled to. The Lower Court held that the boundaries being clearly defined, they must be held to include whatever actual area fell within them, and dismissed the suit. This decision was upheld in appeal.

(3) *Ram Jiawan, plaintiff-appellant,* versus *Secretary of State, defendant-respondent* (*Cawnpore*).—This case was noticed in paragraph 6 (10) and (11), page 3 of the report of last year. In the case in which the Munsif decreed Rs. 38-12-0, his decision was reversed on appeal.

11. *Statement III.—Cases before the High Court, Judicial Commissioner of Oudh, and Her Majesty's Privy Council.*—These were 12 in all. Five were decided, of which one was decided adversely to the State.

The appeal lost was—

Secretary of State, defendant-appellant, versus *Habib-ulla, plaintiff-respondent* (*Gorakhpur*).—This appeal had been pending since 1888, and was noticed at page 3 of the report for the year ending 30th September 1888. The original suit was for possession of 494 acres of forest land by establishment of right and by restraining the Secretary of State's interference. In the Court of first instance the claim of plaintiff (Habib-ulla) was dismissed, but this order was reversed on appeal. The suit was then appealed to the High Court, but abated, owing to no action being taken within the required period to substitute the names of Habib-ulla's representatives on his death, of which occurrence no notice was given to the Legal Remembrancer. The High Court passed no order as to costs. Steps under the Land Acquisition Act were taken to acquire the land.

12. Of the suits in original and appellate Courts in which the State was successful, the following are the more important:—

(1) The High Court dismissed the appeal of Ghansham Narain, who had unsuccessfully sued Government for the recovery of Rs. 2,100, the price of an elephant attached and sold by the Collector of Ballia for arrears of rent.

(2) One Brij Pal sued Government for the possession of 40 biswas and mesne profits of two *mauzas* in the Mainpuri district, aggregating in value Rs. 53,241-9-0. The claim was dismissed.

(3) The Secretary of State sued one Thakur Goberdhan Singh of Kheri for the possession of 588 bighas 1 biswa and Rs. 300 mesne profits: total value Rs. 5,001-6-4 The claim was eventually admitted and decreed with costs in favour of Government.

(4) In Allahabad one Babu Gopal Das sued Government, in the Postal Department, for the recovery of Rs. 951-4-0. The claim was dismissed with costs.

The two cases of Saháranpur shown as decreed in favour of the State as plaintiff in Appendix A, Statement 1, were references under Act X of 1870 in which the Collector's award was upheld by the District Judge. These are the cases shown in Statement III as under appeal to the High Court: the memoranda of appeal containing valuation had not reached the Collector.

The Benares case won by the State as respondent, shown in statement III, was also a compensation case, in which the proprietor had sought revision of the order of the Judge of Benares.

It may be mentioned that the pending case against the State, valued at Rs. 3,55,000, shown against Bahraich in Statement I, is the suit by Inayat-ulla and others, claiming recovery of the shrine of Sayyid Salar with right to offerings. The defence has been partially heard, and the suit may shortly be decided. The appeal in the case Bijay Bahádur Singh *versus* Secretary of State, which is still pending in the High Court, is the case shown against Allahabad (valued at Rs. 1,93,853) in Statement III.

13. *Statement IV.—Realization of sums decreed due to the State.*—The total demand due to the State (including Rs. 18,344-3-2, arrears from previous years) was Rs. 22,635-2-11, of which Rs. 2,282-1-7 or 10 per cent. were collected during the year. In the previous year 23 per cent. was recovered. Rs. 1,153-0-9 were remitted, and the year closed with a total balance of Rs. 19,200-0-7, of which Rs. 1,482-11-9 are reported irrecoverable.

14. The largest balances appear in the following districts:—

	Rs.	a.	p.
Saháranpur...	8,492	8	1
Agra	882	11	0
Etah	2,898	3	6
Mainpuri	863	8	6
Allahabad	2,476	7	9
Kheri	1,085	1	0
Bara Banki	631	12	0

Saháranpur.—The greater portion (Rs. 8,297-15-1) of this balance is due from General Thelwall, whose case was referred to in the report for 1888-89, page 3. The remainder (Rs. 194-9-0) is pending in appeal.

Agra.—Rupees 690-11-0 are due from Mr. Cripps, whose case was noticed in last year's report. The balance is due from Mr. H. L. Beddy, whose property is being traced.

Etah.—For the recovery of this balance judgment-debtor's property has been attached.

Mainpuri.—The greater portion of this balance, *viz.*, Rs. 863-11-6, is reported as irrecoverable, and measures are being taken to recover the balance, Rs. 3-13-0. The irrecoverable amount is costs awarded to Government in Brij Pal's case [see paragraph 12 (2) above]. This man had been allowed to sue *in forma pauperis*. The Collector reported the costs as irrecoverable, but was directed to hold the matter pending for a year, in case trace of any property should be found.

Allahabad.—The greater portion of this balance, *viz.*, Rs. 2,002, and Rs. 165-15-0, is due from the claimants of the Khagapur Estate and Mr. Wright respectively, whose cases were explained in last year's report. Of the remaining balance Rs. 118-10-9 were written off as irrecoverable after the close of the year, and Rs. 190-14-0 are also reported as irrecoverable.

Kheri.—This amount was recovered in full after the close of the year.

Bara Banki.—This arrear is due from Bhup Narain, whose case was noticed in last year's report.

It will be seen that (excluding the Bahraich balance erroneously shown last year) the heavy balances of the previous year re-appear in the present report. The causes of non-realization have been explained above. To those balances are only added the item awarded as costs in Mainpuri, which is irrecoverable, and the balance shown for Kheri, which has been recovered since the close of the year. The low percentage of realization, therefore, in the year under report, arises not from a large accrual of unrealized amounts during the year, but from the presence of large claims of an earlier period of which further immediate realization is difficult or impossible. Three-fourths of the sum decreed to the State during 1891-92 were awarded on account of costs.

15. *Statement V.—Amount expended in litigation.*—The expenditure incurred by the State in its litigation during the year amounted to Rs. 8,810-0-10, of which Rs. 1,012-5-8 was awarded against it in regular suits. The amount actually spent in the prosecution and defence of cases, therefore, was less than that (Rs. 8,238) so spent in the previous year. The total amount recovered was Rs. 2,302-11-7. Under this last item appear, as usual, costs which were awarded in past years, but were recovered during the year under report. It has been explained in previous reports that, as costs have to be paid as soon as the case goes into Court, and some time elapses before they are decreed, and a still further period before they are realized, comparisons can hardly be made between what is expended and what is realized on account of the year's litigation.

16. The districts which show a high expenditure in the conduct of litigation are the following :—

	Receipts.			Disbursements.		
	Rs.	a.	p.	Rs.	a.	p.
Meerut	5	5	5	177	13	5
Sahâranpur		...		799	15	0
Muttra	186	11	0	395	1	0
Mainpuri	303	3	0	1,207	7	5
Shâhjahânpur	753	2	4	1,689	2	9
Allahabad	105	8	0	2,270	2	3
Gorakhpur		...		519	0	0
Kheri		...		287	10	4

Meerut.—The whole of this charge represents the costs disbursed in defending three cases brought against the Secretary of State. Two of these cases were decided in favour of the State, and one was withdrawn.

Sahâranpur.—Rupees 779-7-0 were disbursed in five references under the Land Acquisition Act, two of which are still pending decision of the High Court; the balance, Rs. 20-8-0, represents the costs decreed against the State in one of the above cases.

Muttra.—The greater portion of these charges (*viz.*, Rs. 383-4-6) were expended in prosecuting the case "*Government* versus *Mir Madad Ali*," valued at Rs. 7,145-8-11. The Judge of Agra in this case enhanced the compensation payable to Mir Madad Ali for land taken up by the Brindaban Railway; Government obtained no costs.

Mainpuri.—Rupees 309-4-11 were disbursed on account of sum decreed in *Pahlad Rai, Marwari,* versus *Secretary of State* [*vide* paragraph 6(2) of last report]. Nearly the whole of the balance was spent in defending the suit *Brij Pal* versus *Secretary of State* [*vide* paragraph 12(2), *supra*], valued at Rs. 53,241-9-0, the costs in which amounted to Rs. 878-15-6 (paragraph 14).

Shâhjahânpur.—The sum of Rs. 1,118-2-0 represents the costs expended by Government in prosecuting and defending respectively the two cases *Government* versus *Daulatgir* and *Chote Lal* versus *Government.* The balance was disbursed in conduct of the suit and defence of the appeal *Ujagar Lal* versus *Government.*

Allahabad—Represents the charges in four cases, and in one appeal in the High Court. All but one case, in which Rs. 52-12-9 costs were decreed to Government, are still pending.

Gorakhpur.—Rupees 518-8-0 represents the costs in defending the suit and preferring the appeal in the case *Sital Parshad* versus *Secretary of State* [*vide* paragraph 7 (7) above].

Kheri.—This amount was disbursed in the case *Secretary of State* versus *Thakur Gobardhan Singh*, valued at Rs. 5,004-6-4 [paragraph 12 (3) above].

APPENDIX B.

Municipal Board Litigation.

17. *Statement I.—Suits in Courts of first instance.*—The Municipal Boards were parties to 34 suits (plaintiff in 13 and defendant in 21). Of these, two suits brought against the Benares Municipal Board were decreed against it. These two suits were not reported to the Legal Remembrancer. Of the remainder, seven were decided in favour of the Boards concerned. Two were compromised, and 23 are still pending decision.

18. *Statement II.—Appeals in District Courts.*—In the District Courts four appeals were decided. In two the Board was unsuccessful. Both these were defended by the Municipal Board of Muttra; one of them was not reported to the Legal Remembrancer. The (reported) appeal lost was—

Ram Bharose, appellant, versus *Municipal Board, Muttra, and Ghanshiam Das, respondents.*—In this suit the Municipal Board was sued by one Ram Bharose for damages on account of demolishing part of a *chabutra* and for refusing sanction, at Ghanshiam Das' instance, to the building of a reservoir. In the Court of first instance plaintiff's claim to erect a masonry covering on the *chabutra* was decreed with Re. 1-8-0 damages, and the remainder of the claim was dismissed. In appeal this decision was upheld.

19. *Statement III.—Appeals before the High Court and Judicial Commissioner.*—One appeal (valued at Rs. 510) against the Cawnpore Municipal Board was decreed by the High Court, and one instituted by the Mainpuri Municipal Board was pending at the end of the year. The appeal decided adverse to the Municipal Board was—

Dina Gangaputra, plaintiff-appellant, versus *Municipal Board, Cawnpore, defendant-respondent.*—This suit was noticed in the report for 1888, and arose from an order passed by the Board prohibiting the plaintiff from using a certain *ghát* on the Ganges and there performing his religious ablutions and receiving alms and offerings. It was originally pressed to a decision by the Board against the advice of this office. It was lost in the Court of first instance, and recovered in appeal. The High Court, however, restored the original judgment, holding that the appeal to the lower appellate Court was time-barred.

20. Out of 16 cases and appeals, therefore, which were "decided," Municipal Boards were successful in nine or 56 per cent., and two more were compromised. Three out of the five cases "lost" were not reported to this office.

21. *Statement IV.—Realization of sums decreed.*—The total demand, including Rs. 247-3-4 awarded during the year, was Rs. 3,326-0-7, of which Rs. 355-6-3 (or about 10 per cent.) were realized; leaving a balance of Rs. 2,970-10-4, of which Rs. 532-4-6 are reported as irrecoverable and Rs. 944-0-10 as doubtful. The largest balances are in—

	Rs.	a.	p.
Kásganj (Etah)	304	9	0
Cawnpore...	1,168	15	4
Benares	1,357	3	6

Etah.—With reference to this balance, which was noticed in last year's report, the Collector reports that one of the judgment-debtors is dead, and that the others are men of small means and there seems no hope of the realization of the arrear.

Cawnpore.—Rupees 107-3-0 deposited in Court (*vide* last year's report) have been realized. For the recovery of Rs. 156-12-0 execution proceedings are in progress: and for Rs. 905-6-0 the judgment-debtor's property will be shortly put up to auction.

Benares.—Rupees 95-0-11 were recovered after the year closed. For the recovery of Rs. 87-6-3 the judgment-debtor's house has been sold by auction. Of the balance, Rs. 2-12-0 are reported recoverable, Rs. 227-11-6 irrecoverable (due from one Manna Ahir, who is dead), and Rs. 944-0-10 as doubtful. This last item is due from a certain Matai Singh, who cannot at present be traced.

22. *Statement V.*—Against receipts amounting to Rs. 355-6-3, Rs. 63-5-4 were disbursed by Municipal Boards in payment to decree-holders, and Rs. 524-8-3 in the prosecution and defence of suits, the value of those decided being Rs. 2,277-8-0.

APPENDIX C.

Court of Wards Litigation.

23. *Statement I.—Civil suits in Courts of first instance.*—The Court of Wards, North-Western Provinces, was party to 64 (plaintiff in 37 and defendant in 27) suits and applications before the Courts of original jurisdiction, as against 59 in the preceding year. Forty suits and applications were decided: 24, or 60 per cent., in favour of the Court, 12 adversely to it, and four suits were compromised.

24. The 12 cases entered as lost in the North-Western Provinces included one application for execution of decree against the Janki Pershad estate (Cawnpore), in which the amount of the claim was acknowledged and paid in Court. Two suits out of the four against Babu Sikhir Chand estate (Gorakhpur) were not contested.

25. The particulars of the remaining nine cases are as follows:—

(1) *Bhatpura estate* versus *Niranjan Lal* (*Sháhjahánpur*).—This was a suit for rendition of accounts and for the recovery of Rs. 2,770-12-7, alleged to have been misappropriated by defendant when acting as agent of the deceased owner of the estate. The Subordinate Judge held that there was not sufficient evidence of the misappropriation of rents to substantiate the estate's claim, and dismissed the suit. The Legal Remembrancer did not recommend an appeal.

(2) *Bhatpura estate* versus *Niranjan Lal and another* (*Sháhjahánpur*).—This was a suit for the recovery of Rs. 724-2-0, with interest and costs, under a mortgage deed. The defendant contended that the deed in question was executed under undue influence and at a time when the plaintiff (that is to say, the deceased owner of the estate) was prosecuting him criminally for misappropriating the sum now sued for. It appeared that the mortgage deed had been executed at a time when Niranjan Lal was under prosecution, but on bail: the prosecutor then withdrew from the case; and the Criminal Court acquitted the accused, observing that the prosecution seemed groundless. The Munsif in the civil suit accepted the defendant's plea and dismissed the plaint. The Legal Remembrancer, after consulting the Board, did not advise an appeal from this order.

(3) *Husaini Begam* versus *Sambalhera estate* (*Muzaffarnagar*).—This was a claim to recover Rs. 11,499-6-5 mesne profits accruing during the pendency of the suit which plaintiff had successfully brought for $\frac{5}{40}$ths of the estate. Mr. Deas advised that the claim should be compromised. The Court of Wards admitted plaintiff's claim to three years' profits, *viz.*, Rs. 7,331-3-6, contending that a larger claim was barred by limitation. The Subordinate Judge, however, decreed in plaintiff's favour. An appeal filed is pending in the High Court.

(4) *Ghulam Mustafa* versus *Sambalhera estate* (*Muzaffarnagar*).—This was a suit, valued at Rs. 1,100, for possession of ⅓rd of a house, against the Court of Wards and the other two occupants. The plaintiff contended that the part of the house in question was his ancestral property, and that during his absence on a pilgrimage the Court of Wards took possession by the entry of a tenant in it. The Court of Wards

was unable to obtain full information regarding the property which was in dispute among the family, and withdrew from the defence. The claim was accordingly decreed, the estate being partly exempted from costs.

(5) *Dwarka Parshad* versus *Murari Lal estate* (*Meerut*).—This was a suit by a co-sharer against the lambardár to recover Rs. 713-10-5, alleged balance of profits (including interest) for 1294 and 1295 fasli. The Court of Wards admitted that part of the claim was due, on account of profits for 1295 fasli, but stated that plaintiff had been paid for 1294 and was not entitled to part of the property then. Including interest Rs. 399-13-4 were accordingly decreed in plaintiff's favour.

(6) *Radha Kishen* versus *Janki Parshad estate* (*Cawnpore*).—This was a suit to obtain release of a 2-anna 8-pie share of a village which the plaintiff had mortgaged, and Rs. 2,634-5-3 surplus profits, on the ground that defendant had much more than satisfied the mortgage by collection. The estate claimed several set-offs of considerable amount, upon which, and agreements of the parties respecting them, the suit mainly turned. The Subordinate Judge passed a decree in favour of plaintiff, cancelling the mortgage deed and awarding him Rs. 1,234-2-10. An appeal filed is pending.

(7) *Bhagwat Das* versus *Sarai Mir estate* (*Azamgarh*).—This was a petty suit for possession of a piece of land 13½ yards by 6¾ yards, and for Rs. 25 compensation for stopping the construction of a house and demolishing a wall.

(8) & (9) *Sheo Narain* versus *Babu Sikhár Chand estate* (*Gorakhpur*).—These two suits were for the recovery, respectively, of Rs. 733-2-0 and Rs. 1,320-5-6, alleged to be due to the plaintiff, who was agent of, and also had money-lending dealings with, a firm which belonged to the deceased owner of the estate. The questions involved were of the correct accounts of firms at Gorakhpur and Calcutta, and of the proper rate of interest between the parties. Rs. 549-13-6 and Rs. 892-4-6 were found due to plaintiff from the accounts, which amounts were decreed by the Subordinate Judge. Legal Remembrancer did not advise an appeal.

26. *Oudh.*—The Court of Wards was plaintiff in 137 cases and defendant in 68, making in all 205 cases (against 267 in 1890-91). Of these, 140 were decided; of which 102 or 73 per cent. were in favour of, and 33 against, the Court. Four cases were compromised and one suit against the Court of Wards withdrawn.

The suits lost were—

(1) *Narauli estate* versus *Hafiz-ul-Rahman* (*Bara Banki*).—This suit was for possession of 14 bighas 1 biswa, and Rs. 58-13-3 mesne profits. The estate, however, failed to prove separate possession within limitation, and the village appeared to be bhaiáchára. The Munsif dismissed the suit. Legal Remembrancer did not recommend an appeal, the original information supplied having been misleading.

(2) *Ramnagar estate* versus *Ahmed Husain* (*Bara Banki*).—The claim was for Rs. 300, value of 14 trees, on the allegation that defendant as agent had sold them and not accounted for the price. The plaint was dismissed for want of sufficient evidence. An appeal, instituted without instructions from this office, was withdrawn by order of the Board.

(3) *Karwar estate* versus *Ram Saran Misr* (*Fyzabad*).—The claim was for possession of 36 trees and Rs. 4-8-0 damages. The estate failing to prove right of ownership to trees in the *abádi*, the suit was dismissed.

(4) *Musepur estate* versus *Jagtoo Sukul* (*Fyzabad*).—The claim was for possession of 14½ bighas of land and Rs. 27-8-3. The defendant contended that the land in question was mortgaged to him, and he had not received his mortgage money The estate's plea was that the mortgage was entirely false. The Munsif held that the mortgage money had not been paid, and that defendant was entitled to retain possession of the land. The suit was accordingly dismissed.

(5) *Rehwa estate* versus *Bhaya Narindra Singh* (*Bahraich*).—The suit was for possession of a grove. The estate relied on the settlement records to prove its possession. The Court held that there was sufficient oral and documentary evidence advanced by defendant (a cadet of the talúkdár's family) to rebut the presumption arising from the settlement records, and dismissed the suit. Legal Remembrancer did not recommend an appeal.

(6) *Bhiragobindpur estate* versus *Bhola Lodh* (*Rae Bareli*).—The suit was for recovery of Rs. 13-14-0 due on a bond. The estate failing to trace the defendant (a cultivator), the suit was dismissed.

(7) *Pandriganeshpur estate* versus *Fateh Bahádur Singh* (*Rae Bareli*).—The claim (originally instituted without the Legal Remembrancer's sanction) was to recover Rs. 9, price of the grass in a grove. The Subordinate Judge held that the ownership of the land was in dispute and should have been sued for, and rejected the plaint under section 53, Act XIV of 1882.

(8) *Malauna estate* versus *Gaya Bakhsh* (*Unao*).—The claim was for recovery of Rs. 222-4-0, which had been decreed to defendant under an order of the Civil Court. The amount had been paid in a settlement of village accounts, and a receipt obtained. Notwithstanding this the defendant applied for execution of the aforesaid decree, and the Court, disregarding the payment, as it was not certified under section 258, Civil Procedure Code, passed an order for execution. The Subordinate Judge dismissed the suit to recover the amount levied, as not being cognizable by the Civil Court. An appeal filed is pending.

(9) & (10) *Karwar estate* versus *Ratipal* (*Sultánpur*).—These two cases are really one and the same. It would appear that the late talúkdár of the estate executed a *ruqqa*, under which he authorized defendant's father to deduct Rs. 25 from the annual rent payable by him to the talúkdár. On the death of the defendant's father, the Court of Wards refused to grant this privilege to defendant. The suit was struck off for default on 24th October 1891. It was re-instituted on the 31st of the same month, but was dismissed. An appeal filed is pending.

(11) *Brij Lal* versus *Pokhra estate* (*Bara Banki*).—The claim was for possession of a grove. Owing to want of time, it was opposed without obtaining Legal Remembrancer's previous sanction. The estate contended that the grove, which belonged to one Jawahir, who died without issue, escheated to the estate. The Munsif held that plaintiff, under the Hindu law, succeeded by survivorship to Jawahir.

(12) *Kalka Parshad* versus *Narauli estate* (*Bara Banki*) : (13) *Mir Kalab Husain* versus *Narauli estate* (*Bara Banki*).—The claims in both these cases were similar, being for debts contracted by the father of the minor to pay land revenue due from the estate, and which in fact he did pay into the treasury. The fact had been otherwise stated to Mr. Deas in Mir Kalab Husain's case; and in Kalka Parshad's Mr. Knox had suggested compromising the claim. The whole question turned on benefit to the estate. The Court, taking the view that the money was borrowed for the benefit of the estate, held that the estate was liable for the debts, and decreed the plaintiffs' claims. Legal Remembrancer did not recommend an appeal.

(14) *Mahant Harcharan Das* versus *Ramnagar estate* (*Bara Banki*).—This suit (which arose from the local officers having acted on incorrect information furnished by the Court of Wards subordinate officials) was for the possession of a grove. The estate alleged that there was no heir to the grove, but it was proved that the grove belonged to fakírs, and that the plaintiff was the rightful heir according to the Bairagi custom. The Munsif decreed possession to plaintiff.

(15) *Abdul Kasim* versus *Bhilwal estate and others* (*Bara Banki*).—The suit was for redemption of 48 bighas valued at Rs. 510. The mortgage deed was supposed to be

lost, but on its discovery with another defendant, the estate admitted the claim and the suit was decreed.

(16) *Muhammad Ali* versus *Bhilwal estate* (*Bara Banki*).—The suit was for arrears of pay by a discharged employé. The estate claimed a set-off for damages on account of carelessness and negligence of duty of plaintiff, in allowing one of his subordinates to misappropriate a sum of money. The Court held that the set-off claimed was not a proper one, and decreed plaintiff's claim without costs.

(17) *Khushi Ram* versus *Mullanpur estate* (*Kheri*).—The plaintiff sued for recovery of Rs. 38,974-6-6, balance of accounts rendered. The plaintiff contended that he was owed this amount before the estate was taken over by the Court of Wards; and alleged that he made known his claim and was promised a settlement. The Court held that the Court of Wards had admitted the claim, and its only reason for not satisfying it was that plaintiff's accounts with the estate were supposed not to be correct. The amount was accordingly decreed. An appeal filed is pending, and will be heard by a bench of both Judicial Commissioners.

(18) *Ram Sahai* versus *Tiloi estate* (*Rae Bareli*).—The claim was for recovery of 14 *mahua* trees and Rs. 28 damages. The Legal Remembrancer was informed late of the case, and an adjournment being refused, the suit was decided *ex parte*, possession of five trees only being decreed.

(19) *Sheo Golam* versus *Malauna estate and others* (*Unao*).—The claim was by a mortgagee for possession of property mortgaged for Rs. 10,500. The Deputy Commissioner and his minor wards were impleaded as holding a decree against other defendants, who had mortgaged the property. The claim being admitted, possession was decreed.

(20) *Andan Singh* versus *Surajpur estate and Musammat Rajwanta* (*Bara Banki*). —The claim was for declaration of a reversionary right to certain property valued at Rs. 2,000, which had been sold by the widow of the deceased owner to the Surajpur estate. It being proved that the greater portion of the money was not spent for the benefit of the deceased's estate, and that the sale was not a legal necessity, the Subordinate Judge held that the sale could not affect anything more than the widow's life interest, and decreed plaintiff's claim to succeed after her death.

(21) *Surajpur estate* versus *Mahesh Parshad* (*Bara Banki*).—This was a suit to recover Rs. 998, alleged to have been lent to defendant by the Ráni Chabraj Kuar, when she was in possession during the years 1883 and 1884. The advances appearing not to have been a loan by the estate, the suit was dismissed.

(22) *Tika Ram* versus *Surajpur estate* (*Bara Banki*).—This suit was brought against the estate for balance due on account of principal and interest amounting to Rs. 14,336-7-4. The Ráni (widow of the deceased owner of the estate) arranged to pay plaintiff Rs. 1,128 in cash, and for the balance of her husband's debts to him executed a mortgage deed for Rs. 8,000. The points at issue were, whether plaintiff was entitled to the higher rate of interest charged by him, *viz.*, Rs. 1-12-0 per cent. per mensem, and whether the Ráni was competent to execute the mortgage deed for Rs. 8,000, charging the estate with the mortgage. The District Judge decided both points in favour of plaintiff, and decreed his claim in full. An appeal filed is pending in the Court of the Judicial Commissioner.

27. The remaining claims in which the Court is shown as unsuccessful related to execution of decrees and miscellaneous applications under classes X and XI.

28. The Court of Wards, North-Western Provinces and Oudh, was thus a party, as plaintiff or defendant, to 269 suits. Of these, 126 suits were decided in favour of the Court, 45 adversely to it, 8 were compromised, one withdrawn, and 89 are still pending decision. It is worthy of notice that, while out of a total of 269 cases in the provinces, Oudh contributed 205, of the latter number, 90 cases took place in the Bara Banki district, 41 of them belonging to a single estate (Surajpur).

Two suits of value greater than a lakh of rupees were before the Courts, *viz.*—

(1) Musammat Kamrun Nissa Begam *versus* the Bhandara estate in the Muzaffarnagar district, valued at Rs. 2,30,488.

(2) Brij Bahádur Singh *versus* the Rámpur estate in the Sultánpur district, value Rs. 1,09,427.

The first was compromised. It was a claim to the possession of the Bhandara estate. The plaintiff agreeing to forego her claim to the estate, the Court of Wards agreed to give the estate over to her as guardian of the minors.

In the second case the plaintiff claimed to be entitled to a share in the talúka under the Hindu Law. The matter was decided against him. This case was noticed in paragraph 24 of the Report for the year 1890, page 9.

29. The following two suits also, which appear in Statement No. I, may be mentioned :—

(1) *Mashuk Mahal estate* (*Bareilly*) versus *Shib Lal and others.*—The minor wards had withdrawn a claim to a one-third share of the property of the late Chaudhri Naubat Ram, and this suit was brought to enforce delivery of a village and Rs. 6,152 in cash, which had been promised them in consideration of such withdrawal. The claim was decreed with costs by the Subordinate Judge. An appeal filed by the defendants is pending in the High Court.

(2) The Sikhir Chand estate in Gorakhpur brought a suit against Sant Sahai Rasth. to recover Rs. 19,851 due on *bahikháta* accounts. Rs. 4,020 were decreed to the estate: and the Legal Remembrancer, after consulting the Board, did not recommend an appeal respecting the balance.

The Khairigarh estate in Kheri shows in Statement I the largest pecuniary amount "decreed" on claims made by the estate: but in reality 14 of the 16 cases in which this estate was successful were applications for the execution of decrees, and the largest claim won by it was for Rs. 2,944.

30. *Statement II.—Cases in District Courts of appeal, North-Western Provinces.*—Of 13 appeals in which the Court of Wards was concerned, 8 were decided in favour of the Court and 5 are still awaiting decision.

31. *Oudh.*—There were 38 appeals for disposal; in which the Court was appellant in 7 and respondent in 31. Fifteen appeals (including one withdrawn) were decided, the Court winning 10 and losing 4. The cases lost were—

(1) *Musepur estate, appellant-defendant*, versus *Sheo Balak Kuar, plaintiff-respondent* (*Fyzabad*).—This suit was noticed at page 9 of the report for the year ending 30th September 1890. The finding of the Subordinate Judge was upheld in appeal.

(2) *Baiju Sah, plaintiff-appellant*, versus *Rámnagar estate and others, defendants-respondents* (*Bara Banki*).—This suit was for Rs. 1,666-10-0, price of provisions. It was returned by the Court of first instance on the ground that certain of the defendants had been wrongly joined. This order was reversed in appeal, and the suit on its merits is pending decision.

(3) *Imdad Ali, plaintiff-appellant*, versus *Mailaraiganj estate, defendant-respondent.* (4) *Makhdoom, plaintiff-appellant*, versus *Mailaraiganj estate, defendant-respondent* (*Bara Banki*).—These were references to the appellate Court for the amendment of decrees by altering a rate of rent fixed on *sir* decreed to the appellants. The decrees were amended accordingly, cross-objections by the estate being thrown out.

32. The Court of Wards, North-Western Provinces and Oudh, was thus a party to 51 appeals. As appellants the Court won 5 and lost one; as respondents it won 13 and lost three cases: one appeal filed by the Rámnagar estate was compromised. The remainder, *viz.*, 28 cases, are still awaiting decision.

33. *Statement III.—Cases before the High Court, Judicial Commissioner of Oudh, and Her Majesty's Privy Council.*—In the North-Western Provinces the Court of Wards was party to 22 appeals. Of these 4 were decided in favour of the Court, and 2 against it. The remainder are still pending.

34. Two appeals in which the Court was appellant were unsuccessful, *viz.*—

(1) *Mashuk Mahal estate, defendant-appellant*, versus *Hatim Zamani Begam and Husaini Begam, plaintiffs-respondents* (*Bareilly*).—The original claim was by the widow and daughter of one Fida Ali Khan to recover their legal shares in property consisting of certain revenue-paying and *muáfi* land that had belonged to Nawáb Kazim Ali Khan (father of Fida Ali and husband of Mashuk Mahal), as well as mesne profits and a share of a considerable sum left in cash by Nawáb Kazim Ali Khan. The Subordinate Judge decreed possession of the real property claimed, and a total sum of Rs. 15,859-6-0 (the amount of the plaintiffs' legal share of the cash) together with Rs. 1,881-6-8 mesne profits of the villages. The Court of Wards had chiefly sought, in defending the suit, for a final adjudication on the right of another possible claimant, an alleged second wife of Fida Ali Khan. The appeal, which was instituted under Mr. Knox's directions in 1889, was principally to the effect that costs should not have been awarded against the Court of Wards. The High Court, however, dismissed the appeal.

(2) *Janki Parshad estate, defendant-appellant*, versus *Boodhi Mal, plaintiff-respondent* (*Cawnpore*).—This appeal was filed before the estate came under Court of Wards management. It related to a suit brought by one Boodhi Mal against the widow of the deceased owner of the estate to declare the adoption of the minor Janki Parshad invalid and to set aside a will. The court fee being deficient, the Subordinate Judge ordered payment of a further sum. Boodhi Mal partially complied, and asked for a review of the order, which was granted without the defendant receiving any notice. The appeal to the High Court against this review was dismissed. The case on its merits is now being heard by the Subordinate Judge of Cawnpore.

In the case of the Harchandpur estate (Etáwah) plaintiff sued the estate on a bond executed by the deceased proprietor. The case is reported in *Weekly Notes* of March 19th, 1892. The High Court decreed with costs, on the point of limitation, the appeal by the Collector of Etáwah. The plaintiff obtained leave to appeal to the Privy Council.

35. *Oudh.*—In Oudh there were 21 appeals for disposal: 11 were decided; 5 in favour of the Court and 5 against it, and one, of Musepur (Fyzabad), was withdrawn. The Narauli (Bara Banki) case (*vide* G. O. No. $\frac{2576}{1-827A}$, dated 6th October 1892, and connected correspondence) is pending before the Privy Council. The suit is against Irshad Husain for the talúka of his maternal grandfather, Chaudhri Raza Husain. It was brought by Ahmadi Begam, second wife of Raza Husain. She was unsuccessful in the District Judge's and Judicial Commissioner's Courts, and dying while her appeal was before the Privy Council, has been succeeded as appellant, by permission of the Council, by Umrao Begam, younger daughter of Chaudhri Raza Husain by his first wife.

36. The case shown as decided against the Bahora estate, Sitapur, was an application to the Judicial Commissioner against a decision of the Subordinate Judge. The application was remanded for retrial and was eventually dismissed. The other appeals lost were—

(1) *Rája of Kapurthala, plaintiff-appellant*, versus *Rámnagar estate, defendant-respondent* (*Bara Banki*).

(2) *Rámnagar estate* versus *Rája of Kapurthala* (*Bara Banki*).

These were cross appeals to Her Majesty's Privy Council. Both parties asserted their title to a tract of land on the banks of the Gogra. Their Lordships, after going through the cases, which were first instituted in December 1871 and January 1872 respectively, were of opinion that both the decrees should be discharged, and that an order should be made for plaintiff's (Rája of Kapurthala) possession and mesne profits.

(3) *Sheo Narain, defendant-appellant,* versus *Mullanpur estate, plaintiff-respondent (Kheri).*—This was a claim by the estate for Rs. 57-15-0, value of three emeralds. The Judicial Commissioner set aside the decree of the lower appellate Court, and restored in full that of the Court of first instance, holding that the appeal from the latter had been barred by limitation.

(4) *Mahraj Singh, defendant-appellant,* versus *Khairigarh estate, plaintiff-respondent (Kheri).*—The suit was for the recovery of Rs. 1,297-15-8, due upon a bond. The Court of first instance dismissed the suit on the point of limitation. The lower appellate Court reversed this order, but the Judicial Commissioner restored the order of the Court of first instance. The cause of action dated from the time of redemption of a certain estate, and the Judicial Commissioner held that this did not necessarily mean that it was postponed till the redemption of the whole of that property was completed.

37. Thus there were 43 appeals for disposal in which the Court of Wards, North-Western Provinces and Oudh, was concerned. Of this number, 9 were decided in favour of, and 7 against, the Court; one was withdrawn, and 26 are still to be disposed of.

38. *Statement IV.—Realizations and balances.*—The demands, collections, and remissions of amounts decreed in favour of the Court of Wards are shown in the following table:—

Province.	Outstanding on 1st October 1891.	Awarded during the year.	Total.	Collected.	Remitted.	Balance.
	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
N.-W. Provinces ...	58,080 10 6	31,329 5 0	89,409 15 6	14,843 3 3	6,919 9 2	67,647 3 1
Oudh	54,658 15 0	19,741 8 8	74,400 7 8	30,261 10 2	3,049 11 9	41,089 1 9
Total ...	1,12,739 9 6	51,070 13 8	1,63,810 7 2	45,104 13 5	9,969 4 11	1,08,736 4 10

39. *North-Western Provinces.*—Inclusive of outstanding balances (Rs. 58,080-10-6), the sum to be recovered by the Court of Wards amounted to Rs. 89,409-15-6. Of this sum, Rs. 14,843-3-3 (or 16½ per cent.) have been recovered. The percentage of realization in the North-Western Provinces was 23½ per cent. in 1890-91 and 8½ per cent. in 1889-90. Of the balance still to be recovered, Rs. 2,088-8-7 are reported as irrecoverable, and Rs. 206-1-9 as doubtful, which leaves a recoverable balance of Rs. 65,352-8-9.

The heaviest outstanding balances are in—

	Rs. a. p.
(1) Etáwah, Rosanghpur	1,727 5 1
(2) „ Harchandpur	1,499 8 0
(3) Mainpuri, Bhairon Parshad and Jwala Parshad	10,968 5 10
(4) Bareilly, Mashuk Mahal Begam	9,938 0 0
(5) Allahabad, Bara	7,142 15 3
(6) Ghazipur, Gauri Shankar	23,927 8 11
(7) Gorakhpur, Babu Sikhir Chand	6,856 9 3
(8) „ Majhauli	3,064 4 8

Roshangpur estate (Etáwah).—In respect of Rs. 1,656-11-11, execution proceedings have been suspended by the appellate Court under section 545, Civil Procedure Code, and the balance, Rs. 70-9-2, was, under the order of the Court, not payable till 10th February 1893.

Harchandpur estate (Etáwah).—This balance is pending in appeal.

Bhairon Parshad and Jwala Prasad estate (Mainpuri).—For the recovery of this balance decrees are under execution and attachment proceedings are pending.

Mashuk Mahal estate (*Bareilly*).—In order to the recovery of Rs. 484-15-9 application for copy of decree has been made. For Rs. 702-9-6 property will be put up for sale, and for the balance attachment proceedings are in progress.

Bara estate (*Allahabad*).—Of this balance Rs. 33-6-6 are irrecoverable, and Rs. 206-1-9 are doubtful. Rs. 900 were recovered after the close of the year, and for the balance execution proceedings are in progress. Under the heading "Remitted" are included Rs. 4,672-5-7, which have been removed from the accounts consequent on release of the Partab Chand estate [*vide* note (*a*) to Statement I of Appendix C].

Gauri Shankar estate (*Ghazipur*).—Of this balance Rs. 1,000-8-2 are reported irrecoverable; Rs. 470-7-0 were costs in a suit, which have, since the close of the year, been decreed in appeal against the estate; and for the balance, which is due from Sarju Parshad, proceedings in execution are pending in the Sarun district.

Sikhir Chand estate (*Gorakhpur*).—For the recovery of Rs. 4,240-11-0 judgment-debtor's property has been attached: for Rs. 2,144 attachment proceedings are in progress: and for the balance decrees are under execution.

Majhauli estate (*Gorakhpur*).—For the recovery of Rs. 3,051-5-8 judgment-debtor's property has been attached. The balance is under execution.

40. *Oudh.*—The demand for the year, inclusive of previous outstandings (Rs. 51,658-15-0), amounted to Rs. 74,400-7-8. Rs. 30,261-10-2 (or 40 per cent.) were collected; this percentage compares very favourably with that in the two previous years, *viz.*, 31 in 1890 and 24 in 1891. Rs. 3,019-11-9 were remitted, and the year closed with a balance of outstanding claims of Rs 41,089-1-9, of which Rs 37,347-9-7 are recoverable. Of the remitted amount, Rs. 2,565 was due to the Pandriganeshpur estate in Rae Bareli from one Tula Ram. Tula Ram died, and the Board, on the recommendation of the Legal Remembrancer, wrote off the amount due from him.

41. The estates which show the heaviest balances are—

	Rs	a.	p.
(1) Bara Banki, Surajpur	16,864	13	5
(2) „ Mailoraiganj	1,218	13	7
(3) Kheri, Khairigarh	11,464	15	1
(4) „ Mullanpur	1,378	9	0
(5) „ Kaimahra	1,000	0	0
(6) Bahraich Rehwa	1,094	3	6
(7) Sultánpur, Rámpur	2,329	12	1

Surajpur estate (*Bara Banki*).—Of this balance Rs. 74-8-0 is irrecoverable and Rs. 469-9-0 doubtful; of the remaining balance Rs. 6,083-6-0 is pending in appeal, and in most of the remaining cases proceedings in execution are in progress or pending.

Mailaraiganj estate (*Bara Banki*).—For the recovery of this balance further steps are being taken to execute the decrees, and hopes of its realization are entertained.

Khairigarh estate (*Kheri*).—Of this balance, Rs. 1,657-5-8 are reported irrecoverable: Rs. 99-6-0 have been deposited in Court: Rs. 1,005-8-0 are pending in appeal, and in most of the remaining cases execution proceedings are in progress. The realizations for this estate during the year were very large.

Mullanpur estate (*Kheri*).—For the recovery of Rs. 750-14-0 an application for execution of decree has been filed. The balance is pending in appeal.

Kaimahra estate (*Kheri*).—This balance is being paid by instalments of Rs. 10 periodically from 16th November 1892.

Rehwa estate (*Bahraich*).—For the recovery of Rs 925-3-9, property has been taken possession of by the estate; in satisfaction of the balance Rs. 5-12-0 were received and up to the time the year closed no other property had been found.

Rámpur estate (*Sultánpur*).—For the recovery of Rs. 1,082-6-0 an application for execution of decree was filed, and 17th December 1892 was fixed for hearing. Of the

remaining balance only Rs. 6-0-3 were realized. A second application for execution was about to be filed.

42. *Statement V.—Amount expended in litigation.*—Against disbursements aggregating Rs. 28,859-2-0, Rs. 45,629-9-10 were realized. In the previous year Rs. 38,510-11-1 were recovered and Rs. 37,447-15-6 were disbursed.

The estates which show the heaviest expenditure are—

		Rs.	a.	p
(1)	Etáwah, Roshangpur	1,726	2	6
(2)	Cawnpore, Janki Parshad	1 050	5	10
(3)	Bara Banki, Narauli	1,722	9	10
(4)	,, Rámnagar	1,156	15	3
(5)	,, Surajpur	3,244	14	5
(6)	Kheri, Khairigarh	1,399	11	6
(7)	,, Mullanpur	2,766	15	9
(8)	Fyzabad, Khapradih	1,915	15	9
(9)	Rae Bareli, Binohra	2,642	5	6
(10)	Sultánpur, Rámpur	2,482	0	3

Roshángpur estate (Etáwah).—This amount was expended in prosecuting two cases and defending one High Court appeal.

Janki Parshad estate (Cawnpore).—Rs. 481-2-3 were paid to Damodar Das, decree-holder: the balance was expended in prosecuting two appeals and defending one case.

Narauli estate (Bara Banki).—Rs. 228 were paid by the estate in two cases decided adversely to it; and the balance in conducting 11 cases and one Privy Council appeal.

Rámnagar estate (Bara Banki).—This amount was disbursed in prosecuting 8 cases and one appeal before the District Courts; and defending 7 cases, 3 District Court appeals, and two special appeals, one of which was decided by the Privy Council.

Surajpur estate (Bara Banki).—Rs. 1,677-3-9 were disbursed in prosecuting 31 cases, and 2 appeals before the Judicial Commissioner; and Rs. 1,567-10-8 in defending 10 cases, 9 District Court appeals, and 2 appeals before the Judicial Commissioner. I have remarked above on the large number of cases of this estate.

Khairigarh estate (Kheri).—Rs. 80 were refunded to one Sarat Singh, who paid this sum in excess to the estate in an execution of decree case. The rest of the charges were expended in prosecuting 25 cases and one District Court appeal: and defending one case, 2 District Court appeals, and one before the Judicial Commissioner's Court. The expenditure is small compared with the receipts from suits.

Mullanpur estate (Kheri).—Rs. 130-6-9 were paid in a suit brought by Sheo Narain and Sheo Dyal against the estate. The greater portion of the balance, *viz.* Rs. 1,841-15-5, were the costs incurred in the appeal in Khushi Ram's case pending before the Judicial Commissioner [*vide* paragraph 26 (17) above].

Khapradih estate (Fyzabad).—The greater portion, *viz.*, Rs. 1,000, of this charge was expended in the suit *Narain Das* versus the estate.

Binohra estate (Rae Bareli).—Rs. 2,610 were paid to one Sheo Ratan, and Rs. 4-11-0 to Chiranju, under decrees.

Rámpur estate (Sultánpur).—The greater portion of this charge, Rs. 2,199-14-0, was incurred in defending the suit brought by Brij Bahádur Singh against the estate (paragraph 28 *supra*).

APPENDIX E.

43. *Realization of Government dues in pauper suits.*—The realizations in pauper cases were below the average in the year under report. Out of a total of Rs. 61,508, Rs. 5,052 (or 8 per cent., against 13 per cent. in 1891 and 20 per cent. in 1890) were recovered, and Rs. 16,154 (26 per cent. against 23 per cent. in 1891 and 34 per cent.

in 1890) were expunged as irrecoverable. The year closed with a balance of Rs. 40,301.

44. Balances exceeding Rs. 1,000 are in—

		Rs.
(1)	Muttra	1,930
(2)	Agra	2,325
(3)	Farukhabad	1,383
(4)	Maiupuri	1,852
(5)	Moradabad	3,691
(6)	Cawnpore	1,881
(7)	Allahabad	6,630
(8)	Jaunpur	6,204
(9)	Benares	1,451
(10)	Gházipur	1,435
(11)	Azamgarh	1,199
(12)	Bahraich	2,928

The dues for the year under report were large in Jaunpur. Agra and Gházipur show the largest realizations.

45. A synopsis of the value of claims in suit and decided, in which the State, Municipal Boards, or the Court of Wards, North-Western Provinces and Oudh, were concerned, is subjoined, showing the measure of success that attended the year's litigation from a financial point of view, and the amounts actually expended and realized. These latter sums, however, must be understood subject to the remarks in paragraph 15 above, as to the degree in which they really belong to the year under report. From the value of appeals by the Court of Wards decided should, for comparison with the decreed amount, be subtracted the value (Rs. 1,13,150) of the Janki Parshad suit, Cawnpore district, which, as explained in paragraph 34 above, is still under trial on its merits. Out of the value of claims against the Court of Wards, Rs. 2,30,448 was the value of the Bhandara estate in the Muzaffarnagar district, the claim to which was compromised in the manner stated in paragraph 28 of this report.

	Value of claims or appeals by . . . decided.	Decreed in favour.	Value of claims or appeals against . . . decided.	Decreed against.	Amount expended.	Amount realized.
	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
State ...	29,109 3 2	11,562 7 4	96,859 12 7	13,675 11 6	8,810 0 10	2,302 11 7
Municipalities ...	1,080 8 0	733 8 0	1,197 0 0	655 0 0	587 13 7	355 6 3
Court of Wards ...	3,17,352 9 6	68,678 8 9	6,33,185 15 9	92,389 8 6	28,859 2 0	45,629 9 10

I have the honor to be,

SIR,

Your most obedient servant,

L. M. THORNTON,

Officiating Legal Remembrancer to Government,

N.-W. Provinces and Oudh.

APPENDICES.

APPENDIX A.

STATEMENT I.—*Return of civil suits to which the State was a party and which were pending before or finally decided by Courts of First Instance between October the 1st, 1891, and September the 30th, 1892.*

Division.	District.	State, Plaintiff.									State, Defendant.								
		Number for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	Number of suits pending.	Value of claims pending.	Number for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	Number of suits pending.	Value of claims pending.
	N.-W. PROVINCES.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.
MEERUT ...	Dehra Dún ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	381 1 0	1	1	...	...	17 1 9	...	...
	Saháranpur ...	3	7,288 3 7	2	1	...	...	4,922 6 9	...	...	1	5,500 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	5,500 0 0
	Meerut ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	4,138 2 0	2	...	...	1	...	...	...
	Aligarh ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	No value	...	1	...	...	No value	...	...
AGRA ...	Muttra ...	2	8,921 4 8	...	1	...	...	...	1	1,775 11 9	2	153 5 0	...	...	1	...	...	1	48 0 0
	Agra ...	3	(a)2,539 15 0	2	1	...	...	177 8 0	...	...	1	49 6 0	...	1	...	...	49 0 0	...	...
	Mainpuri ...	1	(b)289 11 0	1	...	...	...	289 11 0	...	...	1	53,241 9 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Etáwah ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	500 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
ROHILKHAND ...	Bijnor ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	18,089 7 3	...	1	...	...	12,150 9 6	1	5,888 13 9
	Budaun ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	150 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Sháhjahánpur ...	1	2,419 8 8	1	...	...	...	489 1 11	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
ALLAHABAD ...	Cawnpore ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	4	2,059 5 6	4	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Allahabad ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	4	9,950 10 3	1	...	...	...	...	3	8,999 6 3
	Jhánsi ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	350 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
BENARES ...	Jaunpur ...	1	104 9 6	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	5	152 0 0	2	...	...	...	...	3	42 0 0
	Mirzapur ...	1	732 0 0	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Benares ...	2	2,586 10 10	...	...	...	2	...	...	...	11	31,461 8 8	1	...	1	1	...	8	31,062 7 10
	Ballia ...	3	12 10 0	3	...	...	...	21 10 0	...	...	1	305 12 4	...	1	...	...	298 7 4	...	...
KUMAUN ...	Garhwál ...	1	11 0 0	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	1	200 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Almora ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	122 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
GORAKHPUR ...	Azamgarh ...	1	81 7 11½	...	...	...	...	...	1	81 7 11½	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Gorakhpur ...	1	263 4 0	1	...	...	...	263 4 0	...	...	2	5,585 4 5	...	2	...	...	985 4 5	...	...
	Basti ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	2,433 5 4½	...	...	...	...	...	1	2,433 5 4½
	Total, N.-W. Provinces ...	20	25,259 5 2½	10	5	...	3	6,163 9 8	2	1,857 3 8½	46	1,34,772 6 9½	17	7	2	2	13,500 7 0	18	53,974 1 2½
	OUDH.																		
LUCKNOW ...	Lucknow ...	3	No value given	2	1	...	...	No value given	...	...	3	1,596 9 0	...	1	...	...	67 0 0	2	1,529 9 0
	Sitapur ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	No value given	...	...	...	...	...	1	No value given.
	Kheri ...	2	(c)6,089 7 4	1	...	...	...	5,004 6 4	1	1,085 1 0	1	1,600 0 0	...	...	1	...	...	...	...
FYZABAD ...	Fyzabad ...	1	99 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	99 0 0	4	243 8 0	4	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Bahraich ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	3,55,056 0 0	...	(e)2	...	...	56 0 0	1	3,55,000 0 0
	Bara Banki ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	505 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	505 0 0
	Partábgarh ...	(d)2	94 5 11	...	...	...	...	...	2	94 5 11	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Total, Oudh ...	8	6,282 13 3	3	1	...	...	5,004 6 4	4	1,278 6 11	13	3,59,001 1 0	4	3	1	...	123 0 0	5	3,57,034 9 0
	Total, N.-W. Provinces and Oudh ...	28	3,1542 2 5½	13	6	...	3	11,168 0 0	6	3,135 10 7½	59	4,93,773 7 9½	21	10	3	2	13,623 7 0	23	4,11,008 10 2½

(a) Government was wrongly shewn as Defendant in the application, valued at Rs. 2,327-7-0, pending last year.

(b) Collector reports that value Rs. 296-15-0 was incorrectly shewn last year.

(c) This value was wrongly shewn last year.

(d) Applications for execution of decrees.

(e) In one case the "value of claim" was *Nil*: it being an application under chapter XXVI, Civil Procedure Code.

APPENDIX A.

STATEMENT II.—*Return of Civil suits to which the State was a party and which were pending before or finally decided by District Courts of Appeal between October the 1st, 1891, and September the 30th, 1892.*

Division.	District.	State, Appellant.									State, Respondent.								
		Number for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	Number of appeals pending.	Value of claims pending.	Number for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	Number of appeals pending.	Value of claims pending.
	N.-W. PROVINCES.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.
MEERUT ...	Meerut ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	2,461 4 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	2,461 4 0
AGRA ...	Agra	1	49 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	49 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
ROHILKHAND ...	Moradabad	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	395 0 0	2	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Budaun	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	150 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	150 0 0
	Shahjahánpur ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	579 4 6	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
ALLAHABAD ...	Cawnpore	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	925 13 0	1	1	...	...	52 4 6	1	690 0 0
BENARES ...	Ballia	1	298 7 4	...	1	...	...	298 7 4	...	...	3	134 0 6	3	...	...	...	...	...	...
GORAKHPUR ...	Azamgarh	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	112 0 0	2	...	...	...	...	...	...
KUMAUN ...	Garhwál	...	...	...	...	...	..	...	...	...	1	20 0 0	1	..	..	..	...	...	...
	Total, N.-W. Provinces ...	2	347 7 4	...	1	...	...	298 7 4	1	49 0 0	14	4,777 6 0	10	1	...	...	52 4 6	3	3,301 4 0
	OUDH.																		
LUCKNOW ...	Lucknow	1	67 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	67 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	..	...
FYZABAD ...	Fyzabad	...	...	...	...	.	...	...	..	...	3	233 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	3	233 8 0
	Gonda	1	123 0 0	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	..	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Bara Banki... ...	...	...	.	...	...	...	...	...	...	(a)1	560 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	560 0 0
	Total, Oudh ...	2	190 0 0	...	1	...	...	...	1	67 0 0	4	793 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	4	793 8 0
	Total, N.-W. P. & Oudh ...	4	537 7 4	...	2	...	...	298 7 4	2	116 0 0	18	5,570 14 0	10	1	...	...	52 4 6	7	4,094 12 0

(a) This appeal was re-submitted by Lower Court, *vide* note (b) in statement No. II of last year's report.

APPENDIX A.

STATEMENT III.—*Suits to which the State was a party and which were pending before or finally decided by the Privy Council, High Court, North-Western Provinces, and Judicial Commissioner, Oudh, between October the 1st, 1891, and September the 30th, 1892.*

Division.	District.	State, Appellant.									State, Respondent.									Remarks.
		Number for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	Number of appeals pending.	Value of claims pending.	Number for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	Number of appeals pending.	Value of claims pending.	
	N.-W. PROVINCES.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p		Rs. a. p.	
MEERUT ...	Saháranpur ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	No value given	...	...	...	...	...	2	No. value given	References under Act X of 1870.
ROHILKHAND ...	Moradabad ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	6,000 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	6,000 0 0	...
ALLAHABAD ...	Fatehpur ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	20 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Allahabad ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,93,853 6 7	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,93,853 6 7	...
BENARES ...	Benares ...	2	5,186 0 0	1	...	...	...	92 0 0	1	5,094 0 0	(b)1	10,498 13 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Ballia	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	2,100 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
GORAKHPUR ...	Gorakhpur ...	2	5,285 4 0	...	1	...	...	...	1	5,100 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Total, N.-W. Provinces	4	10,471 4 0	1	1	...	...	92 0 0	2	10,194 0 0	7	2,12,472 3 7	3	...	...	...	...	4	1,99,853 6 7	...
	OUDH.																			
FYZABAD ...	Gonda	1	(a)4 0 0	1	...	...	...	4 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Total, Oudh ...	1	4 0 0	1	...	...	...	4 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Total, N.-W. Provinces & Oudh ...		5	10,475 4 0	1	1	...	...	96 0 0	2	10,194 0 0	7	2,12,472 3 7	3	...	...	...	...	4	1,99,853 6 7	...

(a) The claim was for possession of land in addition.
(b) The value of this appeal was not shewn last year.

APPENDIX A.

STATEMENT IV (No. I).—*Return showing what portion of the amounts decreed in favour of the State was realized or remitted during the year* 1891-92, *and als the sums outstanding on the* 1*st of October* 1892.

Division.	District.	Sums outstanding on the 1st October 1891.			Awarded to State between 1st October 1891 and 30th September 1892.			Total.			Realized during 1891-92.		
		Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.
	N.-W. PROVINCES.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
MEERUT ...	Saháranpur ...	9,143 11 10	...	...	...	...	194 9 0	9143 11 10	...	194 9 0	...	...	...
	Muzaffarnagar ...	...	...	2 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	2 0 0	...	...	2 0 0
	Meerut ...	...	...	...	...	...	210 11 5	...	...	210 11 5	...	...	5 5 5
AGRA ...	Muttra ...	100 0 0	...	60 13 6	...	15 3 0	15 0 0	100 0 0	15 3 0	75 13 6	100 0 0	15 3 0	71 8 0
	Agra	624 0 0	...	106 14 0	172 8 0	...	24 5 0	796 8 0	...	131 3 0	...	...	5 0 0
	Etah	(a)2,562 10 9	241 3 0	(b)515 12 0	...	...	68 1 0	2,562 10 9	241 3 0	583 13 0	210 0 0	6 6 9	273 0 6
	Mainpuri ...	225 0 0	3 13 0	64 11 0	...	...	877 3 6	225 0 0	3 13 0	941 14 6	225 0 0	...	78 3 0
	Etáwah ...	...	...	...	...	...	41 8 0	...	...	41 8 0	...	...	(d) 41 8 0
ROHILKHAND	Bijnor ...	...	...	2 4 0	...	...	...	...	...	2 4 0	...	...	...
	Moradabad ...	...	...	387 8 0	...	...	21 4 0	...	...	408 12 0	...	...	7 0 0
	Badaun ...	...	...	...	...	...	24 2 0	...	...	24 2 0	...	...	...
	Bareilly ...	156 14 5	10 0 0	...	...	9 6 6	...	156 14 5	19 6 6	...	...	...	...
	Sháhjahánpur ...	...	...	...	489 1 11	106 13 4	218 8 5	489 1 11	106 13 4	218 8 5	489 1 11	106 13 4	157 3 1
ALLAHABAD *	Cawnpore ...	70 0 0	...	9 0 0	...	0 3 0	151 11 0	70 0 0	0 3 0	160 11 0	18 8 0	...	45 11 0
	Fatehpur ...	...	...	39 8 0	...	...	32 2 0	...	...	71 10 0	...	...	35 11 0
	Allahabad ...	369 2 9	74 13 0	2,127 15 0	...	14 12 3	55 4 9	369 2 9	89 9 3	2,183 3 9	133 3 9	31 12 3	0 8 0
BENARES ...	Jaunpur ...	...	...	104 9 6	...	...	6 2 0	...	...	110 11 6	...	...	6 2 0
	Benares ...	...	...	294 8 0	...	...	143 8 3	...	...	438 0 3	...	...	143 8 3
	Ballia	...	...	33 5 6	...	...	123 7 4	...	...	156 12 10	...	...	38 1 4
GORAKHPUR ...	Gorakhpur ...	...	...	...	...	...	3 4 6	...	...	3 4 6	...	...	...
	Azamgarh ...	...	...	...	...	...	33 12 1	...	...	33 12 1	...	...	...
Kumaun ...	Almora ...	...	...	...	...	...	4 0 0	...	...	4 0 0	...	...	4 0 0
Total, N.-W. Provnices ...		13,251 7 9	329 13 0	3,748 12 6	661 9 11	146 6 1	2,248 8 3	13,913 1 8	476 3 1	5,997 4 9	1,175 13 8	160 3 4	914 5 7
	OUDH.												
LUCKNOW ...	Lucknow ...	...	...	...	...	...	9 0 0	...	...	9 0 0	...	...	9 0 0
	Rae Bareli ...	...	...	6 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	6 8 0	...	...	...
	Sitapur ...	...	...	(c) ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Kheri	...	...	...	300 0 0	...	785 1 0	300 0 0	...	785 1 0	...	...	...
FYZABAD ...	Fyzabad ...	...	...	22 5 0	...	...	86 14 3	...	...	109 3 3	...	...	22 11 0
	Bahraich ...	(e)...	...	...	...	...	49 7 0	...	...	49 7 0	...	...	...
	Bara Banki ...	560 0 0	...	71 12 0	...	...	...	560 0 0	...	71 12 0	...	...	...
	Partábgagh ...	269 7 11	36 9 0	47 8 0	...	...	4 1 3	269 7 11	36 9 0	51 9 3	...	...	...
Total, Oudh ...		829 7 11	36 9 0	148 1 0	300 0 0	...	934 7 6	1,129 7 11	36 9 0	1,082 8 6	...	...	31 11 0
Total, N.-W. Provinces and Oudh ...		14,080 15 8	366 6 0	3,896 13 6	961 9 11	146 6 1	3,182 15 9	15,042 9 7	512 12 1	7,079 13 3	1,175 13 8	160 3 4	946 0 7

(a) Last year's balance wrongly shown.
(b) Rs. 34-13-0 were shown in excess last year.
(c) The balance Rs. 7 was in deposit last year and has been realized.
(d) Of this amount Rs. 31-8-0 were deducted from the compensation awarded.
(e) Last year's balance Rs. 879-14-0 was wrongly shown as awarded to State. It was decreed against it.

* The Bánda balance has been written off as irrecoverable.

APPENDIX A.

STATEMENT IV (No. II).—*Return showing what portion of the amounts decreed in favour of the State was realized or remitted during the year* 1891-92, *and also the sums outstanding on the* 1st *of October* 1892.

Division.	District.	Balance.			Remitted.			Net Total.			Analysis of Balance.		
		Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Recoverable.	Irrecoverable.	Doubtful.
	N.-W. P.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
MEERUT ...	Saháranpur ...	9,143 11 10	...	194 9 0	845 12 9	...	...	8,297 15 1	...	194 9 0	8,492 8 1	...	...
	Meerut	...	...	205 6 0	...	...	...	...	...	205 6 0	205 6 0	...	...
AGRA ...	Muttra	...	...	4 5 6	...	...	...	...	...	4 5 6	4 5 6	...	...
	Agra	796 8 0	...	126 3 0	...	...	40 0 0	796 8 0	...	86 3 0	882 11 0	...	...
	Etah	2,352 10 9	234 12 3	310 12 6	...	...	...	2,352 10 9	234 12 3	310 12 6	2,898 3 6	...	...
	Mainpuri	...	3 13 0	863 11 6	...	...	...	...	3 13 0	863 11 6	3 13 0	863 11 6	...
ROHILKHAND	Bijnor	...	...	2 4 0	...	...	...	...	...	2 4 0	...	2 4 0	...
	Moradabad ...	...	...	401 12 0	...	...	0 7 0	...	...	401 5 0	401 5 0	...	...
	Budaun	...	...	24 2 0	...	...	...	...	...	24 2 0	24 2 0	...	...
	Bareilly	156 14 5	19 6 6	...	...	...	...	156 14 5	19 6 6	...	176 4 11	...	...
	Sháhjahánpur ...	...	...	61 5 4	...	...	...	...	...	61 5 4	61 5 4	...	...
ALLAHABAD ...	Cawnpore	51 8 0	0 3 0	115 0 0	1 8 0	0 3 0	14 9 0	50 0 0	...	100 7 0	150 7 0	...	...
	Fatehpur	...	...	35 15 0	...	...	...	...	...	35 15 0	35 15 0	...	...
	Allahabad	235 15 0	57 13 0	2,182 11 9	...	...	...	235 15 0	57 13 0	2,182 11 9	2,165 15 0	310 8 9	...
BENARES ...	Jaunpur	...	...	104 9 6	...	...	...	...	...	104 9 6	104 9 6	...	...
	Benares	...	...	294 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	294 8 0	...	294 8 0	...
	Ballia	...	...	118 11 6	...	...	...	...	...	118 11 6	107 0 0	11 11 6	...
GORAKHPUR ...	Gorakhpur ...	...	...	3 4 6	...	...	...	...	...	3 4 6	3 4 6	...	...
	Azamgarh	...	...	33 12 1	...	...	...	...	...	33 12 1	33 12 1	...	...
	Total, N.-W. P. ...	12,737 4 0	315 15 9	5,082 15 2	847 4 9	0 3 0	55 0 0	11,889 15 3	315 12 9	5,027 15 2	15,750 15 5	1,482 11 9	
	OUDH.												
LUCKNOW ...	Rae Bareli... ...	...	...	6 8 0	...	...	6 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Kheri	300 0 0	...	785 1 0	...	...	...	300 0 0	...	785 1 0	1,085 1 0	...	...
FYZABAD ...	Fyzabad	...	...	86 8 3	...	...	...	...	...	86 8 3	86 8 3	...	...
	Bahraich	...	...	49 7 0	...	...	...	...	...	49 7 0	49 7 0	...	...
	Bara Banki ...	560 0 0	...	71 12 0	...	...	...	560 0 0	...	71 12 0	631 12 0	...	...
	Partábgarh ...	269 7 11	36 9 0	51 9 3	175 2 0	36 9 0	32 6 0	94 5 11	...	19 3 3	113 9 2	...	...
	Total, Oudh ...	1,129 7 11	36 9 0	1,050 13 6	175 2 0	36 9 0	38 14 0	954 5 11	...	1,011 15 6	1,966 5 5		
	Total, N.-W. P & Oudh.	13,866 11 11	352 8 9	6,133 12 8	1,022 6 9	36 12 0	93 14 0	12 844 5 2	315 12 9	6,039 14 8	17,717 4 10	1,482 11 9	

APPENDIX A.

STATEMENT V.—*Showing the amount expended on litigation as contrasted with sums actually realized by the State under decrees of the Court between 1st October 1891 and 30th September 1892.*

Division.	District.	Receipts.	Nature of disbursements.				Remarks.
			Amount including costs awarded against the State in regular suits.	In prosecution.	In defence.	Total.	
	N.-W. PROVINCES.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	
MEERUT ...	Saháranpur ...	...	20 8 0	200 3 0	579 4 0	799 15 0	
	Muzaffarnagar ...	2 0 0	...	...	1 9 0	1 9 0	
	Meerut	5 5 5	...	...	177 13 5	177 13 5	
	Aligarh	...	...	...	1 0 0	1 0 0	
AGRA ...	Muttra	186 11 0	...	389 5 6	5 11 6	395 1 0	
	Agra	5 0 0	339 10 0	11 15 0	2 1 0	353 10 0	
	Farukhabad ...	...	36 14 0	...	...	36 14 0	
	Etah	489 7 3	32 6 6	...	...	32 6 6	Advanced for expenses to Government Pleader.
	Mainpuri	303 3 0	309 4 11	5 6 0	892 12 6	1,207 7 5	
	Etáwah	(a)41 8 0	...	...	9 0 0	9 0 0	(a) *Vide* note d, Statement No. IV.—(1).
ROHILKHAND,	Moradabad	7 0 0	...	75 0 0	3 5 0	78 5 0	
	Bijnor	...	163 8 3	...	...	163 8 3	Advanced for expenses to Government Pleader.
	Budaun	...	...	...	29 13 0	29 13 0	
	Sháhjahánpur ...	753 2 4	...	1,155 7 7	533 11 2	1,689 2 9	
ALLAHABAD ...	Cawnpore	64 3 0	...	16 3 3	52 1 9	68 5 0	
	Fatehpur	35 11 0	...	...	20 0 0	20 0 0	
	Allahabad	165 8 0	...	...	2,270 2 3	2,270 2 3	
BENARES ...	Jaunpur	6 2 0	...	101 3 0	15 0 0	116 3 0	
	Mirzapur	...	...	16 0 0	...	16 0 0	
	Benares	(b) 163 8 3	...	1 9 0	114 13 9	116 6 9	(b) The difference Rs. 20 between this amount and that shown in statement No. IV (I) is due to this sum being recovered and paid to the Agent Governor-General Benares in a case.
	Gházipur	...	110 2 0	...	...	110 2 0	
	Ballia	38 1 4	...	63 1 9	39 6 6	102 8 3	
	Gorakhpur	...	...	266 8 0	252 8 0	519 0 0	
	Azamgarh	...	...	10 0 0	28 0 0	38 0 0	
	Basti	...	...	...	1 5 0	1 5 0	
KUMAUN ...	Almora	4 0 0	...	...	5 12 0	5 12 0	
	Total, N.-W. Provinces...	2,270 6 7	1,012 5 8	2,311 14 1	5,035 1 10	8,359 5 7	
	OUDH.						
LUCKNOW ...	Lucknow	9 0 0	...	33 2 6	7 6 3	40 8 9	
	Sitapur	...	...	...	10 3 3	10 3 3	
	Kheri	...	...	287 10 4	...	287 10 4	
FYZABAD ...	Fyzabad	22 11 0	...	8 4 9	9 9 9	17 14 6	
	Bahraich	(c)0 10 0	...	...	...	...	
	Gonda	...	...	71 13 11	...	71 13 11	(c) Refunded by Government Pleader; not shown in statement IV (I).
	Bara Banki... ...	...	...	1 8 3	16 15 0	18 7 3	
	Partábgarh	...	...	...	4 1 3	4 1 3	
	Total, Oudh ...	32 5 0	...	402 7 9	48 3 6	450 11 3	
	Total, N.-W. P. and Oudh	2,302 11 7	1,012 5 8	2,714 5 10	5,083 5 4	8,810 0 10	

APPENDIX B.

STATEMENT I.—*Return of civil suits to which the Municipal Board was a party and which were pending before or finally decided by Courts of First Instance between October the 1st, 1891, and September the 30th, 1892.*

Division.	District.	Municipality.	Municipal Board, Plaintiff.									Municipal Board, Defendant.								
			Number for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	Number of suits pending.	Value of claims pending.	Number for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	Number of suits pending.	Value of claims pending.
	N.-W. PROVINCES.			Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.
MEERUT ...	Debra Dún ...	Mussoorie ...	1	1,000 0 0	1	...	...	...	653 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Saháranpur ...	Saháranpur ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	20 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
AGRA ...	Muttra ...	Muttra ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	7	317 0 0	...	...	1	...	...	6	217 0 0
	Etah ...	Kásganj ...	3	273 4 9	...	...	...	...	...	3	273 4 9	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
ROHILKHAND	Budaun ...	Budaun ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	150 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Bareilly ...	Bareilly ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	100 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	100 0 0
ALLAHABAD ...	Cawnpore ...	Cawnpore ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	1,126 0 0	...	...	1	...	...	2	1,026 0 0
BENARES ...	Jaunpur ...	Jaunpur ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	17 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Benares ...	Benares ...	8	2,245 7 0	2	...	...	...	80 8 0	6	2,164 15 0	4	139 14 0	...	2	...	...	50 0 0	2	89 14 0
	Total, N.-W. Provinces ...		12	3,518 11 9	3	...	...	...	733 8 0	9	2,438 3 9	18	1,869 14 0	3	2	2	...	50 0 0	11	1,432 14 0
	OUDH.																			
LUCKNOW ...	Hardoi ...	Hardoi ...	1	16 6 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	16 6 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
FYZABAD ...	Fyzabad ...	Fyzabad ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	60 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	60 0 0
	Bahraich ...	Bahraich ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	262 1 6	1	...	...	...	...	1	257 1 6
	Total, Oudh ...		1	16 6 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	16 6 0	3	322 1 6	1	...	...	...	...	2	317 1 6
	Total, N.-W. Provinces and Oudh		13	3,535 1 9	3	...	...	...	733 8 0	10	2,454 9 9	21	2,191 15 6	4	2	2	...	50 0 0	13	1,749 15 6

APPENDIX B.

Statement II.—*Return of Civil Suits to which the Municipal Board was a party and which were pending before or finally decided by District Courts of Appeal between October the 1st, 1891, and September the 30th, 1892.*

Division.	District.	Municipality.	Municipal Board, Appellant.									Municipal Board, Respondent.								
			Number for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	Number of appeals pending.	Value of claims pending.	Number for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	Number of appeals pending.	Value of claims pending.
				Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.
Meerut ...	Saháranpur ...	Saháranpur ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	20 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	..	...
	Meerut	Gháziabad ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	20 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	20 0 0
Agra ...	Muttra ...	Muttra ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	95 0 0	...	2	...	...	95 0 0	...	...
Rohilkhand	Budaun	Budaun ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	150 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	150 0 0
Allahabad...	Cawnpore ...	Cawnpore ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	130 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
Benares ...	Jaunpur ...	Jaunpur ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	17 0 0	...	...	...	..	...	1	17 0 0
	Benares ...	Benares ...	2	30 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	2	30 0 0	...	...	..	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Oudh. *Nil.*																			
	Total, N.-W. Provinces ...		2	30 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	2	30 0 0	7	432 0 0	2	2	...	...	95 0 0	3	187 0 0

APPENDIX B.

STATEMENT III.—*Suits to which the Municipal Board was a party and which were pending before or finally decided by the Privy Council, High Court, N.-W. Provinces, and Judicial Commissioner, Oudh, between October the 1st, 1891, and September the 30th, 1892.*

Division.	District.	Municipality.	Municipal Board, Appellant.									Municipal Board, Respondent.								
			Number for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	Number of appeals pending.	Value of claims pending.	Number for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	Number of appeals pending.	Value of claims pending.
	N.-W. PROVINCES.			Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.
AGRA ...	Mainpuri ...	Mainpuri ...	1	700 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	700 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
ALLAHABAD	Cawnpore ...	Cawnpore ..	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	510 0 0	...	1	...	...	510 0 0	...	...
	OUDH. *Nil.*																			
	Total, N.-W. P. and Oudh ...		1	700 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	700 0 0	1	510 0 0	...	1	...	...	510 0 0	...	...

APPENDIX B.

STATEMENT IV (No. I).—*Return showing what portion of the amounts decreed in favour of the Municipal Board was realized or remitted during the year* 1891-92, *and also the sums outstanding on the* 1st *of October* 1892.

Division.	District.	Municipality.	Sums outstanding on the 1st October 1891.			Awarded to Municipal Board between 1st October 1891 and 30th September 1892.			Total.			Realized during 1891-92.		
			Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.
	N.-W. PROVINCES.		Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
MEERUT	Dehra Dún ...	Dehra Dún ...	...	...	103 4 0	...	...	...	...	...	103 4 0	...	...	...
	Saháranpur ...	Saháranpur ...	...	...	...	...	...	8 2 0	...	...	8 2 0	...	...	...
	Meerut ...	Gháziabad ..	...	...	11 14 6	...	...	...	...	...	11 14 6	...	...	...
AGRA ...	Farukhabad	Farukhabad ...	...	...	17 5 0	...	...	6 12 6	...	...	24 1 6	...	...	24 1 6
	Etah ..	Kásganj ...	179 0 0	59 5 0	66 4 0	...	...	...	179 0 0	59 5 0	66 4 0	...	...	...
	Mainpuri ...	Mainpuri ...	...	...	0 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	0 8 0	...	...	...
ROHILKHAND.	Moradabad ..	Moradabad ...	4 8 0	1 11 3	9 9 6	...	...	...	4 8 0	1 11 3	9 9 6	4 8 0	1 11 3	9 9 6
	Budaun ...	Budaun ...	...	...	...	...	...	14 10 0	...	...	14 10 0	...	...	...
	Pilibhít ...	Pilibhít ...	38 0 0	11 12 3	32 3 0	...	...	26 6 6	38 0 0	11 12 3	58 9 6	38 0 0	11 12 3	57 1 6
ALLAHABAD.	Cawnpore ...	Cawnpore ...	1,109 7 6	...	156 9 10	...	...	27 8 0	1,109 7 6	...	184 1 10	46 4 6	...	78 5 6
BENARES ...	Benares ...	Benares ...	927 0 0	146 13 5	146 0 0	80 8 0	63 9 1	18 5 0	1,007 8 0	210 6 6	164 5 0	25 0 0	...	...
GORAKHPUR.	Gorakhpur ..	Gorakhpur ...	...	...	57 10 0	...	...	1 6 3	...	...	59 0 3	...	...	59 0 3
	OUDH. *Nil.*													
	Total, N.-W. Provinces ...		2,257 15 6	219 9 11	601 3 10	80 8 0	63 9 1	103 2 3	2,338 7 6	283 3 0	704 6 1	113 12 6	13 7 6	228 2 8

APPENDIX B.

STATEMENT IV. (No. II.)—*Return showing what portion of the amounts decreed in favour of the Municipal Board was realized or remitted during the year* 1891-92, *and also the sums outstanding on the* 1st *of October* 1892.

Division.	District.	Municipality.	Balance.			Remitted.			Net total.			Analysis of balance.		
			Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Recoverable.	Irrecoverable.	Doubtful.
	N.-W. PROVINCES.		Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
MEERUT ...	Dehra Dún ...	Dehra Dùn	...	...	103 4 0	...	...	...	...	...	103 4 0	103 4 0		
	Saháranpur ...	Saháranpur ...	...	...	8 2 0	...	...	...	...	...	8 2 0	8 2 0		
	Meerut ...	Gháziabad ...	...	...	11 14 6	...	...	...	...	...	11 14 6	11 14 6		
AGRA ...	Etah ...	Kásganj ...	179 0 0	59 5 0	66 4 0	...	...	...	179 0 0	59 5 0	66 4 0	...	304 9 0	
	Mainpuri ...	Mainpuri ...	...	...	0 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	0 8 0	0 8 0		
ROHILKHAND	Budaun ...	Budaun ...	...	...	14 10 0	...	...	...	...	...	14 10 0	14 10 0		
	Pilibhít ...	Pilibhít ...	...	...	1 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	1 8 0	1 8 0		
ALLAHABAD...	Cawnpore ...	Cawnpore ...	1,063 3 0	...	105 12 4	...	...	...	1,063 3 0	...	105 12 4	1,168 15 4		
BENARES ...	Benares ...	Benares ...	982 8 0	210 6 6	164 5 0	...	...	...	982 8 0	210 6 6	164 5 0	185 7 2	227 11 6	944 0 10
	OUDH. *Nil.*													
	Total, N.-W. Provinces and Oudh ...		2,224 11 0	269 11 6	476 3 10	...	...	...	2,224 11 0	269 11 6	476 3 10	1,494 5 0	532 4 6	944 0 10

APPENDIX B.

STATEMENT V.—*Showing the amount expended on litigation as contrasted with sums actually realized by the Municipal Board under decrees of the Court between 1st October 1891 and 30th September 1892.*

Division.	District.	Municipality.	Receipts.	Nature of disbursements.				Remarks.
				Amount including costs awarded against the Municipal Board in regular suits.	In prosecution.	In defence.	Total.	
			Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	
	N.-W.- PROVINCES.							
MEERUT ...	Saháranpur ...	Saháranpur ...	...	...	17 3 0	42 1 0	59 4 0	
	Meerut ...	Gháziabad ...	...	...	...	0 8 0	0 8 0	
AGRA ...	Muttra ...	Muttra ...	...	8 12 0	...	73 0 0	81 12 0	
	Farukhabad ...	Farukhabad ..	24 1 6	...	...	...	...	
	Mainpuri ...	Mainpuri ...	...	...	125 9 0	...	125 9 0	
ROHILKHAND	Moradabad ...	Moradabad ...	15 12 9	...	...	...	...	
	Budaun ...	Budaun ...	...	...	...	35 1 3	35 1 3	
	Sháhjahánpur...	Sháhjahánpur	...	54 9 4	...	...	54 9 4	
	Pilibhít ...	Pilibhít ...	106 13 9	...	41 13 0	16 12 6	58 9 6	
ALLAHABAD ...	Cawnpore ...	Cawnpore ...	124 10 0	...	...	135 15 6	135 15 6	
BENARES ...	Jaunpur ...	Jaunpur ...	...	...	...	1 6 0	1 6 0	
	Benares ...	Benares ...	25 0 0	...	18 5 0	14 10 0	32 15 0	
GORAKHPUR ...	Gorakhpur ...	Gorakhpur ...	59 0 3	...	...	...	...	
	Total, N.-W. Provinces ...		355 6 3	63 5 4	202 14 0	319 6 3	585 9 7	
	OUDH.							
LUCKNOW ...	Hardoi ...	Hardoi ...	...	...	2 4 0	...	2 4 0	
	Total, Oudh ...		...	...	2 4 0	...	2 4 0	
Total, N.-W. Provinces and Oudh ...			355 6 3	63 5 4	205 2 0	319 6 3	587 13 7	

APPENDIX C.

Statement I.—*Return of civil suits to which the Court of Wards was a party and which were pending before or finally decided by Courts of First Instance between 1st October 1891 and 30th September 1892.*

District	Estate	Estate, Plaintiff.								Estate, Defendant.							
		Number for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	Number of suits pending.	Value of claims pending.	Number for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	Number of suits pending.	Value of claims pending.
	N.-W. Provinces.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.
Muzaffarnagar	Bhandara	1	40 0 0	1	...	...	...	40 0 0	...	...	1	2,30,448 8 0	...	...	1	...	...	...	...
	Sambalhera	...	...	...	...	...	...	...			2	12,599 6 5	...	2	...	...	8,431 3 6	...	...
Meerut	Ram Saran Das	1	75 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	75 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Murari Lal	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	5	3,984 10 10	2	1	...	...	399 13 4	2	637 9 9
Etáwah	Harchandpur	1	1,545 8 4	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,545 8 4	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Rosanghpur	2	1,610 5 11	1	...	...	...	60 0 0	1	1,550 5 11	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Bijnor	Anandi	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	307 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	307 0 0
Bareilly	Masluk Mahal Begam	1	44,974 0 0	1	...	...	...	8,565 13 10	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Shahjahánpur	Azizganj	1	150 0 0	1	...	...	...	150 0 0	...	...		...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Khamaria	2	7,326 11 6	...	...	...	...	...	2	7,326 11 6	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Bamrauli	1	862 6 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	862 6 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Bhatpura	6	4,144 10 10	...	2	1	...	...	3	354 14 3	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Cawnpore	Pandit Amar Nath	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	514 2 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	514 2 0
	Misri Lal	1	(b)375 0 0	1	...	...	...	375 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Janki Parshad	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	6,732 12 8	...	2	1	...	1,675 2 10	...	...
Allahabad	Bara (a)	1	1,210 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,210 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Raghuraj Singh	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	47 9 8	...	...	...	...	...	1	47 9 8
Bánda	Ganesh Singh	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,700 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,700 0 0
Jaunpur	Batak Parshad	6	1,817 13 11	6	...	...	...	1,817 13 11	...	...		...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Azamgarh	Sarai Mir	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	10 0 0	...	1	...	...	10 0 0	...	...
Ghazipur	Lachmi Narayan	1	1,487 12 9	1*	...	...	...	1,392 0 0	...	...	2	53 8 0	2	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Gauri Shankar	2	22,282 4 7	1	...	...	...	72 10 0	1	22,209 10 7	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Mainpuri	Bhairon Parshad and Jwala Parshad	6	11,200 3 1	...	...	1	...	...	5	11,110 3 1	2	3,067 1 9	2	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Sujrai	2	139 14 6	2	...	...	...	139 14 6	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Gorakhpur	Babu Sikhir Chand	2	22,026 13 6	2	...	...	...	6,195 9 2	...	...	5	2,353 7 6	...	4	...	...	1,581 10 6	1	200 0 0
	Majhauli	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,186 4 6	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Choumakha	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	2,645 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	2,645 0 0
	Total, N.-W. Provinces	37	121,268 8 11	17	2	2	...	18,808 13 5	16	46,244 11 8	27	2,65,649 7 4	7	10	2	...	12,097 14 2	8	6,051 5 5

	Oudh.																					
Bara Banki ...	Pokhra ...	3	(a)18,634 9 5	2	...	...	...	2,144 9 5	1	16,490 0 0	1	95 0 0	...	1	...	...	95 0 0	...	...			
	Mailaraiganj ...	2	2,612 14 3	1	...	...	...	2,555 11 3	1	57 3 0	2	45 0 0	2	...	...	...	...	...	...			
	Narauli ...	3	3,184 0 0	1	1	...	...	13 15 6	1	2,889 0 6	8	13,474 13 9	4	2	2	...	2,784 0 9	...	...			
	Ramnagar ...	8	11,856 0 0	2	2	...	...	560 0 0	...	10,968 12 0	7	7,292 5 3	4	1	...	...	300 0 0	2	964 15 3			
	Kharka ...	3	1,500 0 0	1	...	...	...	1,350 0 0	2	150 0 0	2	187 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	2	187 0 0			
	Bhilwal ...	1	67 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	67 0 0	3	3,642 0 0	1	2	...	...	750 0 0	...	...			
	Akhyapur ...	1	40 0 0	1	...	...	...	40 0 0	...	...	2	2,012 0 0	...	...	...	1	...	1	2,000 0 0			
	Surajpur ...	31	24,137 2 9	19	5	...	...	11,608 13 6	7	8,436 0 5	10	59,099 3 11	4	2	...	...	16,336 7 11	4	12,703 10 6			
	Tanda ...	1	750 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	750 0 0	2	2,704 2 0	...	1	...	...	204 2 6	1	2,500 0 0			
Hardoi ...	Khajurahra ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	50 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	50 0 0			
Kheri ...	Khairigarh ...	25	45,608 15 9	16	2	...	...	25,325 13 8	7	15,884 10 9	1	646 11 6	1	...	...	...	...	...	...			
	Kaimahra ...	3	1,945 4 9	2	...	1	...	23 8 0	...	...	1	80 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	80 0 0			
	Mullaupur ...	4	5,860 2 0	2	...	...	...	177 12 9	2	5,682 5 3	3	58,534 2 3	1	1	...	...	38,974 6 6	1	1,849 11 9			
Sitapur ...	Akbarpur ...	2	179 3 9	1	...	...	...	79 3 9	1	100 0 0	2	854 1 3	2	...	...	...	...	...	...			
	Bahora ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	No value given	1	...	...	...	...	...	...			
Fyzabad ...	Khapradih ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	10,416 15 0	3	...	...	...	...	...	...			
	Karwar ...	2	2,025 0 0	...	1	...	...	...	1	2,000 0 0	1	103 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	103 0 0			
	Musepur ...	3	10,069 5 9	1	1	...	...	30 0 0	1	9,815 1 6	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...			
Bahraich ...	Rehwa ...	2	2,165 0 0	(d)1	1	...	...	No value	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...			
Rae Bareli ...	Tilei ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	541 0 0	...	1	...	...	103 0 0	2	438 0 0			
	Bhiragobindpur ...	3	50 6 0	2	1	...	...	37 2 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...			
	Pandriganeshpur ...	6	3,961 3 2	2	1	...	...	96 1 0	3	3,796 2 2	2	3,323 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	1	3,000 0 0			
	Bahua ...	2	411 0 6	1	...	...	...	9 10 6	1	401 6 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...			
	Binohra ...	2	159 7 0	1	...	...	...	73 12 0	1	85 11 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...			
Unao ...	Madarnagar ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	21,967 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	21,967 8 0			
	Malanna ...	1	222 4 0	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	2	16,548 0 0	...	1	1	...	10,500 0 0	...	...			
	Gayanpur ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	210 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	210 0 0			
Sultánpur ...	Rámpur ...	6	3,569 14 1	5	...	...	...	1,686 0 1	1	1,883 14 0	3	1,11,074 7 5	2	...	...	...	...	1	1,247 6 1			
	Walipur ...	(e)1	44 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	44 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...			
	Karwar ...	16	911 15 0	8	3	...	...	82 8 9	5	268 4 9	5	574 7 7	2	1	...	...	219 0 0	2	181 8 0			
	Khapradih ...	5	314 13 6	4	1	...	...	114 13 6	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...			
Partábgarh	Bargaon ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	20,000 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	20,000 0 0			
	Dahyawan ...	1	92 12 0	1	...	...	...	92 12 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...			
	Total, Oudh ...	137	1,40,312 5 8	74	20	1	...	46,102 3 8	42	79,769 4 4	68	3,33,474 14 5	28	13	3	1	70,266 1 8	23	67,482 11 7			
	Total, N.-W. P. and Oudh ...	174	2,61,580 14 7	91	22	3	...	64,911 1 1	58	1,26,014 0 0	95	5,99,124 5 9	35	23	5	1	82,363 15 10	31	73,534 1 0			

(a) The suits, &c., of the Partab Chand estate have been transferred to this estate.
(b) Raised by the order of the Munsif's Court from Rs. 200 to Rs. 375.
(c) The value of one suit was reduced to Rs. 2,044-9-5.
(d) This was an objection under section 278, C. P. Code.
(e) This is a new suit.
NOTE.—The Nagla kisi, Bhikari mipor, and Mohona Estates are no longer under Court of Wards' management.

APPENDIX C.

STATEMENT II.—*Return of civil suits to which the Court of Wards was a party and which were pending before or finally decided by District Courts of Appeal between the 1st October 1891 and the 30th September 1892.*

District.	Estate.	Estate, Appellant.									Estate, Respondent.								
		No. for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	Number of appeals pending.	Value of claims pending.	Number for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	Number of appeals pending.	Value of claims pending.
	N.-W. PROVINCES.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p
Meerut ...	Ram Saran Das ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	142 8 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Murari Lal	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	5	3,348 11 6	2	...	...	...	...	3	3,064 1 8
Cawnpore ...	Janki Parshad ...	1	1,612 8 6	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,612 8 6	..	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Azámgarh ...	Sarai Mir	1	10 0 0	..	...	...	...	...	1	10 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Ghazipur ...	Gauri Shankar ...	1	216 8 0	1	...	...	...	216 8 0	...	...	1	316 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
Gorakhpur ...	Majhauli	1	10 0 0	1	...	...	...	10 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Mainpuri ...	Bhairon Parshad and Jwala Parshad.	1	27 0 0	1	...	...	...	27 0 0	...	...	1	250 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Total N.-W. Provinces...	5	1,876 0 6	3				253 8 0	2	1,622 8 6	8	4,057 3 6	5					3	3,064 1 8
	OUDH.																		
Bara Banki ...	Surajpur ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	9	19,023 9 3	1	...	...	...	...	8	14,109 8 3
	Ramnagar	1	300 0 0				1				3	6,176 10 0		1			1,666 10 0	2	4,510 0 0
	Mailaraganj ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	4	380 0 0	...	2	...	...	335 0 0	2	45 0 0
	Tanda	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	500 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
Kheri ...	Khairigarh	1	1,297 15 8	1	...	...	...	1,297 15 8	...	...	2	2,078 12 6	...	...	...	...	...	2	2,078 12 6
	Mullanpur	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	5,154 10 3	1	...	...	...	...	2	5,054 10 3
Sitapur ...	Akbarpur	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	312 10 9	...	...	...	...	...	1	312 10 9
Fyzabad ...	Musepur	(a)1	3,861 2 0	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	1	130 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	130 0 0
Rae Bareli ...	Tiloi	3	2,023 15 3	1	...	...	...	700 0 0	2	1,323 15 3	1	30 0 0	...	..	...	...	...	1	30 0 0
Sultánpur ...	Rámpur	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	400 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	400 0 0
	Karwar	1	250 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	250 0 0	5	26 8 1	5	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Total, Oudh ...	7	7,733 0 11	2	1	...	1	1,997 15 8	3	1,573 15 3	31	34,212 12 10	8	3	...	...	2,001 10 0	20	26,670 9 9
	Total, N.-W. Provinces and Oudh.	12	9,609 1 5	5	1	...	1	2,251 7 8	5	3,196 7 9	39	38,270 0 4	13	3	...	...	2,001 10 0	23	29,734 11 5

(a) The appeal for Rs. 1,308-0-0, that appeared as pending in last year's report, is shown in statement No. III as it was an appeal to the Judicial Commissioner's Court.

APPENDIX C.

STATEMENT III.—*Suits to which the Court of Wards was a party and which were pending before or finally decided by the Privy Council, High Court, North-Western Provinces, and Judicial Commissioner, Oudh, between the 1st October 1891 and the 30th September 1892.*

District.	Estate.	Estate, Appellant.									Estate, Respondent.									Remarks.
		No. for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	No. of appeals pending.	Value of claims pending.	No. for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	Number of appeals pending.	Value of claims pending.	
	N.-W. PROVINCES.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.	
Muzaffarnagar...	Sambalhera ...	1	7,791 5 6	...	...	...	...	...	1	7,791 5 6	1	15,997 4 9	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	
Etáwah ...	Rosaughpur ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	7,448 15 7	...	...	...	...	...	1	7,448 15 7	
	Harchandpur ...	1	23,795 14 0	1	...	...	...	1,499 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
Moradabad ...	Mohib Ali Khan ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	5,151 7 6	...	...	...	...	...	1	5,151 7 6	
Meerut ...	Murari Lal ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	72,665 8 11	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	
Bareilly ...	Mashuk Mahal Begam ...	1	25,904 2 3	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	1	44,917 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	44,917 0 0	
Bijnor ...	Anandi ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,097 14 3	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,097 14 3	
Sháhjahánpur	Khirya ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	2,500 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	2,500 0 0	
	Bhatpura ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,191 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,191 0 0	
Cawnpore ...	Janki Parshad ...	1	1,13,150 0 0	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
Fatehpur ...	Kasimpur ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	32,902 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	2	32,902 0 0	
Azamgarh ...	Sarai Mir ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	5,798 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	5,798 0 0	
Gházipur ...	Gauri Shankar ...	2	5,200 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	2	5,200 0 0	1	316 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	316 0 0	
Gorakhpur ...	Babu Sikhir Chand ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	20,000 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	20,000 0 0	
	Majhauli ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	240 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	240 0 0	
	Bansgaon ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	28,827 7 2	...	...	...	...	...	1	28,827 7 2	Pending before the Privy Council.
	Total, N.-W. Provinces...	6	1,75,841 5 9	1	2			1,499 8 0	3	12,991 5 6	16	2,39,052 10 2	3					13	1,50,389 12 6	
	OUDH.																			
Bára Banki ...	Narauli ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,82,477 12 7	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,82,477 12 7	Pending before the Privy Council.
	Surajpur ...	2	14,505 1 11	...	...	...	...	...	2	14,505 1 11	2	2,228 9 9	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	Both these appeals were decided by the Privy Council.
	Ramnagar ...	1	11,198 9 0	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	1	6,668 0 0	...	1	...	...	6,668 0 0	...	...	
	Tanda ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	7,189 11 9	...	...	...	...	...	2	7,189 11 9	One for Rs. 5,143 9-3, pending before the Privy Council.
Kheri ...	Mallanpur ...	1	41,830 0 7	...	...	...	...	...	1	41,830 0 7	1	57 15 0	...	1	...	...	57 15 0	...	...	
	Khairigarh ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,297 15 8	...	1	...	...	1,297 15 8	...	...	
Fyzabad ...	Khapradih ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	9,331 15 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	9,331 15 0	
	Musepur ...	1	1,308 0 0	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	Application under sec. 622, Civil Procedure Code.
Bahraich ...	Rehwa ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	No value	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	
Sitapur ...	Bahora ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	No value	...	(a)1	...	...	...	...	...	Ditto ditto
Rae Bareli ...	Tiloi ...	1	545 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	545 0 0	1	200 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	200 0 0	
Unao ...	Mahana ...	1	222 4 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	222 4 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
Sultánpur ...	Karwar ...	1	16 8 0	1	...	...	...	16 8 0	...	...	1	145 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Total, Oudh ...	8	69,625 7 6	1	1	...	1	16 8 0	5	57,102 6 6	13	2,09,596 15 9	4	4	...	...	8,023 14 8	5	1,99,199 7 4	
	Total, N.-W. P. & Oudh	14	2,45,466 13 3	2	3	...	1	1,516 0 0	8	70,093 12 0	29	4,48,649 9 11	7	4	...	...	8,023 14 8	18	3,49,589 3 10	

(a) Remanded to original court for re-trial.

APPENDIX C.

STATEMENT IV. (No. I.)—*Return showing what portion of the amounts decreed in favour of the Court of Wards was realized or remitted during the year* 1891-92, *and also the sums outstanding on the* 1st *of October* 1892.

District.	Estate.	Sums outstanding on the 1st October 1891.			Awarded to Court of Wards between 1st October 1891 and 30th September 1892.			Total.			Realized during 1891-92.		
		Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.
	N.-W. PROVINCES.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
Muzaffarnagar.	Bhandara ...	200 0 0	63 14 0	157 9 0	40 0 0	...	10 13 0	240 0 0	63 14 0	168 6 0	...	...	...
Meerut ...	Ram Saran Das ...	104 12 0	(a)47 1 6	25 14 0	...	...	26 4 0	104 12 0	47 1 6	52 2 0	104 12 0	47 1 6	44 0 0
	Murari Lal ...	4,571 13 11	144 7 3	(b)61 15 3	...	13 12 0	168 0 0	4,571 13 11	158 3 3	229 15 3	4,044 9 4	100 13 6	182 2 6
Muttra ...	Parshadi Lal ...	46 0 0	2 11 0	18 13 0	...	2 4 6	1 9 0	46 0 0	4 15 6	20 6 0	30 0 0	...	...
Etáwah ...	Roshangpur ...	736 10 11	103 15 0	709 12 0	60 0 0	106 15 2	10 0 0	796 10 11	210 14 2	719 12 0	...	...	...
	Harchandpur ...	...	...	...	...	...	1,499 8 0	...	...	1,499 8 0	...	...	...
Mainpuri ...	Arjunpur ...	623 0 9	193 6 0	144 11 0	...	...	...	623 0 9	193 6 0	144 11 0	72 0 0	...	...
	Sujrai ...	...	...	745 9 3	62 7 6	2 4 0	33 15 0	62 7 6	2 4 0	779 8 9	62 7 6	2 4 0	779 8 9
	Bhairon Parshad and Jwala Parshad.	...	...	...	9,029 5 7	1,796 5 6	404 10 9	9,029 5 7	1,796 5 6	404 10 9	191 6 3	14 5 6	56 4 3
Rijnor ...	Sahanpur ...	150 2 3	8 1 4	66 5 11	...	2 3 4	7 6 0	150 2 3	10 4 8	67 11 11	86 12 9	10 2 2	67 11 11
	Anandi ...	...	...	229 2 4	...	...	10 0 0	...	...	239 2 4	...	...	239 2 4
Moradabad	Anand Sarup ...	367 11 4	37 0 9	58 10 1	...	...	...	367 11 4	37 0 9	58 10 1	...	...	...
Bareilly ...	Mashuk Mahal Begam.	(b)1,492 12 0	(b)283 5 5	(b)227 7 11	6,152 0 0	221 8 4	2,437 6 4	7,644 12 0	504 13 9	2,664 14 3	876 8 0	...	...
Sháhjahánpur.	Azizganj ...	(c)899 7 6	(d)36 15 6	(c)79 10 5	...	22 15 3	...	899 7 6	59 14 9	79 10 5	35 8 3	19 7 4	22 0 5
	Bhatpura ...	202 1 11	41 0 0	32 2 0	38 1 3	...	10 9 0	240 3 2	41 0 0	42 11 0	...	...	...
	Bamranli ...	...	...	2 11 0	...	...	...	...	...	2 11 0	...	...	2 11 0
	Khanaria ...	62 11 0	22 5 0	15 5 0	...	...	...	62 11 0	22 5 0	15 5 0	...	...	...
	Khirya ...	...	...	90 1 4	...	...	...	...	...	90 1 4	...	...	...
Allahabad	Confiscated estates ...	26 12 5	...	87 15 5	...	...	...	26 12 5	...	87 15 5	14 15 3	...	...
	Bara(i) ...	10,626 1 3	1,144 5 8	(b)1,807 10 0	...	344 10 1	246 6 7	10,626 1 3	1,488 15 9	2,054 0 7	1,287 13 3	410 6 11	649 7 10
Cawnpore	Misri Lal ...	...	...	...	...	...	63 2 0	...	...	63 2 0	...	...	...
	Janki Parshad ...	...	...	...	...	...	116 0 0	...	...	116 0 0	...	...	116 0 0
Jaunpur ..	Batak Parshad ...	750 0 0	(b)700 7 9	(b)267 10 0	72 3 6	21 5 5	34 13 9	822 3 6	721 13 2	302 7 9	810 8 0	718 8 3	295 5 6
Azamgarh ..	Sarai Mir ...	...	...	21 3 0	...	...	...	...	...	21 3 0	...	...	...
Gházipur...	Lachmi Narayan ...	1,104 7 0	518 12 3	158 4 6	...	66 4 4	22 14 6	1,104 7 0	585 0 7	181 3 0	900 0 0	476 1 0	118 11 0
	Gauri Shankar ...	15,175 9 11	4,780 14 9	3,029 2 2	...	910 8 7	103 15 6	15,175 9 11	5,691 7 4	3,133 1 8	...	...	72 10 0
Gorakhpur	Babu Sikhir Chand	1,193 9 0	32 6 11	642 0 0	6,195 9 2	290 5 7	494 6 0	7 389 2 2	322 12 6	1,136 6 0	1,224 11 0	112 12 0	529 2 0
	Majhauli ...	2,287 5 4	532 14 11	92 0 5	...	138 6 6	38 1 6	2,287 5 4	671 5 5	130 1 11	...	1 1 8	23 6 4
	Total, N.-W. P. ...	40,621 0 6	8,694 1 0	8,765 9 0	21,649 11 0	3,939 12 7	5,739 13 5	62,270 11 6	12,633 13 7	14,505 6 5	9,731 15 7	1,912 15 10	3,198 3 10

	OUDH.												
Bara Banki	Pokhra ...	25 13 0	...	(g) 1,044 9 5	...	...	...	25 13 0	...	1,044 9 5	4 0 0	...	490 0 0
	Mailaraiganj ...	...	...	2,555 11 3	...	...	15 8 0	...	...	2,571 3 3	...	...	1,352 5 8
	Narauli ...	13 15 6	...	...	...	...	3 13 3	13 15 6	...	3 13 3	13 15 6	...	3 13 3
	Ramnagar ...	1,169 0 0	102 14 0	194 5 6	520 0 0	...	126 6 0	1,689 0 0	102 14 0	320 12 6	...	...	24 0 6
	Surajpur ...	13,705 10 6	...	2,157 9 5	4,360 12 6	55 9 3	3,197 0 9	18,066 7 0	55 9 3	5,354 10 2	5,492 13 0	55 9 3	1,063 6 9
	Kharka ...	...	...	...	...	...	16 4 0	...	...	16 4 0	...	...	...
	Bhilwal ...	...	...	...	...	...	36 2 6	...	...	36 2 6	...	...	36 2 6
Kheri ...	Khairigarh ...	13,844 5 9	(e) 9,257 1 11	(f) 2,792 14 0	2,514 5 9	2,593 11 1	977 10 1	16,358 11 6	11,850 13 0	3,770 8 1	10,540 11 9	7,697 9 8	2,276 12 1
	Mullanpur ...	...	...	779 15 9	...	...	794 2 0	...	...	1,574 1 9	...	...	195 8 9
	Kaimahra ...	...	...	...	707 8 0	316 0 0	...	707 8 0	316 0 0	...	23 8 0	...	...
Sitapur ...	Akbarpur ...	238 10 3	...	12 11 0	...	...	45 5 0	238 10 3	...	58 0 0	79 3 9	...	58 0 0
	Bahora ...	...	...	274 6 0	...	...	97 11 0	...	...	372 1 0	...	...	...
Fyzabad ...	Muscpur ...	...	...	106 7 0	30 0 0	...	48 0 0	30 0 0	...	154 7 0	...	...	108 13 6
	Khapradih ...	...	...	796 14 0	...	...	255 8 6	...	...	1,052 6 6	...	...	243 8 9
	Karwar ...	214 0 0	...	67 8 0	...	...	24 8 0	214 0 0	...	92 0 0	...	...	52 9 0
Bahraich ...	Rehwa ...	156 1 6	34 6 0	955 14 9	...	...	25 14 0	156 1 6	34 6 0	981 12 9	12 9 6	3 2 0	31 6 9
Rae Bareli	Tiloi ...	...	...	...	...	...	162 3 0	...	...	162 3 0	...	...	...
	Bhiragobindpur ...	95 10 6	...	0 8 0	17 6 0	...	3 7 6	113 0 6	...	3 15 6	17 6 0	...	3 15 6
	Pandriganeshpur ...	2,475 3 8	2 2 2	264 11 6	...	3 12 4	29 1 0	2,475 3 8	5 14 6	293 12 6	84 0 0	1 8 0	26 14 6
	Bahua ..	412 5 0	...	169 14 9	9 10 6	...	1 4 0	421 15 6	...	171 2 9	9 10 6	...	10 0 0
	Binohra ...	3 0 0	...	6 3 0	73 12 0	...	12 13 0	76 12 0	...	19 0 0	3 0 0	...	6 3 0
Sultánpur	Rámpur ...	...	...	...	727 8 0	358 6 0	1,413 2 1	727 8 0	358 6 0	1,413 2 1	127 8 0	...	41 12 0
	Walipur ...	235 14 10	...	80 1 9	...	...	3 13 2	235 14 10	...	83 14 11	...	...	6 5 2
	Karwar ...	81 0 7	15 5 6	237 3 9	63 3 2	...	49 4 9	144 3 9	15 5 6	286 8 6	9 0 7	...	25 6 0
	Khapradih ...	...	...	...	20 13 6	...	9 2 0	20 13 6	...	9 2 0	20 13 6	...	8 10 0
Partábgarh	Bargaon ...	64 8 0	...	14 4 6	...	17 14 3	3 4 9	64 8 0	17 14 3	17 9 3	...	...	...
	Total Oudh ...	32,735 3 1	9,411 13 7	12,511 14 4	9,044 15 5	3,345 4 11	7,351 4 4	41,780 2 0	12,757 2 6	19,863 2 8	16,438 4 1	7,757 12 11	6,065 9 2
	Total, N.-W. P. and Oudh.	73,356 3 7	18,105 14 7	21,277 7 4	30,694 10 5	7,285 1 6	13,091 1 9	1,04,050 14 0	25,391 0 1	34,368 9 1	26,170 3 8	9,670 12 9	9,263 13 0

NOTE.—The Nagla Kisi, Bhikari minor, and Mohona Estates are no longer under Court of Wards' management and the Nagla Anni balances have not been carried forward as they refer to a rent suit.

(a) Rupees 2-2-6 were wrongly calculated and added last year by Collector.
(b) These balances were wrongly shown by Collector last year.
(c) The difference was shown as written off in last year's report.
(d) Collector reports Rs. 2 as wrongly included last year.
(e) Rupees 344-2-3 were wrongly included last year.
(f) Rupees 1-8-0 were wrongly included last year and Rs. 51-7-0 have been added within the year.
(g) Reduced to Rs. 1,044-9-5 by the order of Civil Court owing to difference in the rate of exchange of Privy Council dues.
(h) Rupees 19-6-0 were wrongly included by Collector last year.
(i) *Vide* note (a) statement No. I, appendix C.

APPENDIX C.

STATEMENT IV, (No. II.)—*Return showing what portion of the amounts decreed in favour of the Court of Wards was realized or remitted during the year* 1891-92, *and also the sums outstanding on the* 1*st of October* 1892—(concluded).

District.	Estate.	Balance.			Remitted.			Net Total.			Analysis of Balance.		
		Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Recoverable.	Irrecoverable.	Doubtful.
		Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
	N.-W. PROVINCES.												
Muzaffarnagar	Bhandara ...	240 0 0	63 14 0	168 6 0	200 0 0	63 14 0	157 9 0	40 0 0	...	10 13 0	50 13 0	...	...
Meerut ...	Ram Saran Das ...	...	...	8 2 0	...	...	...	...	...	8 2 0	8 2 0	...	...
	Murari Lal ...	537 4 7	57 5 9	47 12 9	226 0 3	7 15 0	8 13 0	311 4 4	49 6 9	38 15 9	201 8 4	198 2 6	...
Muttra ...	Parshadi Lal ...	16 0 0	4 15 6	20 6 0	...	...	...	16 0 0	4 15 6	20 6 0	41 5 6	...	...
Etáwah ...	Roshangpur ...	796 10 11	210 14 2	719 12 0	...	...	...	796 10 11	210 14 2	719 12 0	1,727 5 1	...	...
	Harchandpur ...	...	...	1,499 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	1,499 8 0	1,499 8 0	...	...
Mainpuri ...	Arjunpur ...	551 0 9	193 6 0	144 11 0	551 0 9	193 6 0	144 11 0	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Bhairon Parshad and Jwala Parshad.	8,837 15 4	1,782 0 0	348 6 6	...	...	...	8,837 15 4	1,782 0 0	348 6 6	10,968 5 10	...	...
Bijnor ...	Sahanpur ...	63 5 6	0 2 6	...	63 5 6	0 2 6	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Moradabad ...	Anand Sarup ...	367 11 4	37 0 9	58 10 1	...	...	...	367 11 4	37 0 9	58 10 1	463 6 2	...	...
Bareilly ...	Mashuk Mahal Begam.	6,768 4 0	504 13 9	2,664 14 3	...	...	...	6,768 4 0	504 13 9	2,664 14 3	9,938 0 0	...	...
Shahjahánpur.	Aziz ganj ...	863 15 3	40 7 5	57 10 0	...	...	...	863 15 3	40 7 5	57 10 0	105 9 3	856 7 5	...
	Bhatpura ...	240 3 2	41 0 0	42 11 0	...	...	...	240 3 2	41 0 0	42 11 0	323 14 2	...	...
	Khamaria ...	62 11 0	22 5 0	15 5 0	...	...	...	62 11 0	22 5 0	15 5 0	100 5 0	...	...
	Khirya ...	...	...	90 1 4	...	...	...	...	...	90 1 4	90 1 4	...	...
Allahabad ...	Confiscated estates,	11 13 2	...	87 15 5	11 13 2	...	87 15 5	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Bara ...	9,338 4 0	1,078 8 10	1,404 8 9	3,802 10 0	248 3 7	627 8 9	5,535 10 0	830 5 3	777 0 0	6,903 7 0	33 6 6	206 1 9
Cawnpore ...	Misri Lal ...	...	...	63 2 0	...	...	...	...	...	63 2 0	63 2 0	...	...
Jaunpur ...	Batak Parshad ...	11 11 6	3 4 11	7 2 3	...	...	2 5 3	11 11 6	3 4 11	4 13 0	19 13 5	...	...
Azamgarh ...	Sarai Mir ...	...	...	21 3 0	...	...	21 3 0	...	...	...	...	...	...
Gházipur ...	Lachmi Narayan	204 7 0	108 15 7	62 8 0	204 7 0	108 15 7	62 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Gauri Shankar ...	15,175 9 11	5,691 7 4	3,060 7 8	...	...	...	15,175 9 11	5,691 7 4	3,060 7 8	22,927 0 9	1,000 8 2	...
Gorakhpur	Babu Sikhir Chand	6,164 7 2	210 0 6	607 4 6	...	41 12 5	83 6 0	6,164 7 2	168 4 1	523 14 0	6,856 9 3	...	...
	Majhauli ...	2,287 5 4	670 3 9	106 11 7	...	...	...	2,287 5 4	670 3 9	106 11 7	3,064 4 8	...	...
Total, N.-W. Provinces ...		52,538 11 11	10,720 13 9	11,307 2 7	5,059 4 8	664 5 1	1,195 15 5	47,479 7 3	10,056 8 8	10,111 3 2	65,352 8 9	2,088 8 7	206 1 9

	Oudh.													
Bara Banki	Pokhra ...	21 13 0	...	554 9 5	...	...	...	21 13 0	...	554 9 5	554 9 5	...	21 13 0
	Mailaraiganj ...	...	...	1,218 13 7	...	...	...	...	...	1,218 13 7	1,218 13 7	...	...
	Ramnagar ...	1,689 0 0	102 14 0	296 12 0	...	...	...	1,689 0 0	102 14 0	296 12 0	667 6 0	...	1,421 4 0
	Surajpur ...	12,573 10 0	...	4,291 3 5	...	...	...	12,573 10 0	...	4,291 3 5	16,320 12 5	74 8 0	469 9 0
	Kharka ...	...	...	16 4 0	...	...	...	...	...	16 4 0	16 4 0	...	...
Kheri ...	Khairigarh ...	5,817 15 9	4,153 3 4	1,493 12 0	...	...	...	5,817 15 9	4,153 3 4	1,493 12 0	9,807 9 5	1,657 5 8	...
	Mullaipur ...	...	...	1,378 9 0	...	...	...	...	...	1,378 9 0	1,378 9 0	...	...
	Kaimahra ...	684 0 0	316 0 0	...	...	...	...	684 0 0	316 0 0	...	1,000 0 0	...	...
Sitapur ...	Akbarpur ...	159 6 6	...	...	...	...	...	159 6 6	...	...	159 6 6	...	...
	Bahora ...	...	...	372 1 0	...	...	...	...	...	372 1 0	372 1 0	...	...
Fyzabad ...	Musepur ...	30 0 0	...	45 10 0	...	...	...	30 0 0	...	45 10 0	75 10 0	...	...
	Khapradih ...	...	...	808 13 9	...	...	...	...	...	808 13 9	808 13 9	...	...
	Karwar ...	214 0 0	...	39 7 0	...	...	...	214 0 0	...	39 7 0	253 7 0	...	...
Bahraich ...	Rehwa ...	143 8 0	31 4 0	950 6 0	18 1 3	...	12 13 3	125 6 9	31 4 0	937 8 9	1,094 3 6	...	...
Rae Bareli...	Tiloi... ...	...	...	162 3 0	...	...	...	...	...	162 3 0	162 3 0	...	...
	Bhiragobindpur ...	95 10 6	...	...	...	...	...	95 10 6	...	...	...	95 10 6	...
	Pandriganeshpur...	2,391 3 8	4 6 6	286 14 0	2,391 3 8	...	239 5 6	...	4 6 6	27 8 6	31 15 0	...	...
	Bahua ...	412 5 0	...	161 2 9	65 5 0	...	18 10 0	347 0 0	...	142 8 9	489 8 9	...	...
	Binohra ...	73 12 0	...	12 13 0	...	...	...	73 12 0	...	12 13 0	85 11 0	...	0 14 0
Sultánpur ...	Rámpur ...	600 0 0	358 6 0	1,371 6 1	...	...	...	600 0 0	358 6 0	1,371 6 1	2,329 12 1	...	...
	Walipur ...	235 14 10	...	77 9 9	227 1 4	...	77 3 9	8 13 6	...	0 6 0	9 3 6	...	...
	Karwar ...	135 3 2	15 5 6	261 2 6	...	...	...	135 3 2	15 5 6	261 2 6	411 11 2	...	...
	Khapradih ...	...	...	0 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	0 8 0	...	0 8 0	...
Partábgarh ...	Bargaon ...	64 8 0	17 14 3	17 9 3	...	...	...	64 8 0	17 14 3	17 9 3	99 15 6	...	...
	Total, Oudh ...	25,341 14 5	4,999 5 7	13,797 9 6	2,701 11 3	...	348 0 6	22,640 3 2	4,999 5 7	13,449 9 0	37,347 9 7	1,828 0 2	1,913 8 0
	Total, N.-W. P. and Oudh.	77,880 10 4	15,720 3 4	25,104 12 1	7,760 15 11	664 5 1	1,543 15 11	70,119 10 5	15,055 14 3	23,560 12 2	102,700 2 4	3,916 8 9	2,119 9 9

APPENDIX C.

STATEMENT V.—*Showing the amount expended on litigation as contrasted with sums actually realized by the Court of Wards under decrees of the Court between 1st October 1891 and 30th September 1892.*

District.	Estate.	Receipts.	Nature of disbursement.			
			Amount, including costs awarded against the Court of Wards in regular suits.	In prosecution.	In defence.	Total.
	N.-W. PROVINCES.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p	Rs. a. p.
Muzaffarnagar ..	Bhandara	...	...	6 4 0	635 5 3	641 9 3
	Sambalhera	...	...	400 4 0	377 15 0	778 3 0
Meerut ...	Ram Saran Das	195 13 6	...	31 5 0	...	31 5 0
	Murari Lal	4,317 9 4	15 3 0	...	211 2 0	226 5 0
Muttra ...	Parshadi Lal	30 0 0	...	...	...	...
Etáwah ...	Harchandpur	...	...	180 10 0	...	180 10 0
	Rosanghpur	...	...	85 11 0	1,640 7 6	1,726 2 6
Mainpuri ...	Arjunpur	72 0 0	...	...	...	...
	Sujrai	844 4 3	...	20 0 0	...	20 0 0
	Bhairon Parshad & Jwala Parshad	262 0 0	221 1 3	66 8 6	123 0 6	410 10 3
Bijnor ...	Sahanpur	164 10 10	...	...	5 7 0	5 7 0
	Anaudi	239 2 4	...	...	15 0 9	15 0 9
	Kiratpur	...	6 4 11	...	...	6 4 11
Moradabad ...	Mohib Ali Khan	...	...	...	8 4 0	8 4 0
	Anand Sarup	...	...	35 2 0	...	35 2 0
Bareilly ...	Mashuk Mahal Begam ...	876 8 0	...	...	...	...
Sháhjahánpur ...	Azizganj	77 0 0	...	...	...	...
	Bhatpura	...	...	198 12 3	...	198 12 3
	Baurauli	2 11 0	...	35 11 6	...	35 11 6
	Khamaria	...	...	128 0 3	...	128 0 3
	Khirya	...	...	...	126 0 0	126 0 0
Fatehpur ...	Kasimpur	...	...	2 9 6	...	2 9 6
Allahabad ...	Bara Estate	2,347 12 0	...	465 8 1	29 10 6	495 2 7
	Confiscated Estates... ...	14 15 3	...	...	...	...
	Raghuraj Singh	...	...	...	5 1 3	5 1 3
Cawnpore ...	Misri Lal	...	...	49 12 6	...	49 12 6
	Janki Parshad	116 0 0	481 2 3	116 2 9	453 0 10	1,050 5 10
Jaunpur ...	Batak Parshad	1,824 5 9	...	...	...	...
Gházipur. ...	Lachmi Narayan	1,494 12 0	...	94 3 3	7 1 6	101 4 9
	Gauri Shankar	72 10 0	297 11 0	60 7 3	47 13 9	406 0 0
Gorakhpur ...	Majhauli	24 8 0	317 3 0	2 11 0	64 4 0	384 2 0
	B. Sikhir Chand	1,866 9 0	224 13 6	580 7 9	151 0 1	956 5 4
	Total, N.-W. P. ...	14,843 3 3	1,563 6 11	2,580 2 7	3,900 9 11	8,024 3 5

APPENDIX C.

STATEMENT V.—*Showing the amount expended on litigation as contrasted with sums actually realized by the Court of Wards under decrees of the Court between 1st October 1891 and 30th September 1892*—(concluded).

District.	Estate.	Receipts.	Nature of disbursement.			
			Amount, including costs awarded against the Court of Wards in regular suits.	In prosecution.	In defence.	Total.
	OUDH.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
Bara Banki ...	Pokhra	494 0 0	3 10 0	90 7 0	13 5 9	107 6 9
	Mailaraiganj	1,352 5 8	...	187 4 6	101 1 3	288 5 9
	Narauli	17 12 9	228 0 0	390 5 3	1,104 4 7	1,722 9 10
	Bhilwal	36 2 6	45 6 0	26 3 9	58 5 9	129 15 6
	Rámnagar	24 0 6	...	562 15 0	594 0 3	1,156 15 3
	Akhyapur	...	...	32 14 0	163 8 0	196 6 0
	Surajpur	6,611 13 0	...	1,677 3 9	1,567 10 8	3,244 14 5
	Kharka	...	...	31 7 9	24 14 3	56 6 0
	Tanda	...	204 2 6	21 8 3	83 11 6	309 6 3
Kheri ...	Khairigarh	20,515 1 6	(a) 80 0 0	1,203 2 3	116 9 3	1,399 11 6
	Mullanpur	195 8 9	130 6 9	1,097 14 6	1,538 10 6	2,766 15 9
	Kainahra	(b) 548 4 5	...	111 0 3	4 4 0	115 4 3
Sitapur ...	Akbarpur	137 3 9	5 0 0	23 4 0	48 14 3	77 2 3
	Bahora	...	...	...	361 2 9	361 2 9
Fyzabad ...	Musepur	108 13 0	...	62 11 0	80 2 0	142 13 0
	Khapradih	243 8 9	0 8 0	777 14 0	1,137 9 9	1,915 15 9
	Karwar	52 9 0	12 11 0	160 3 0	6 6 0	179 4 0
Bahraich ...	Rehwa	47 2 3	...	140 11 0	...	140 11 0
Rae Bareli ...	Bhiragobindpur	21 5 6	...	37 2 0	...	37 2 0
	Pandriganeshpur	112 6 6	...	429 14 4	101 0 0	530 14 4
	Bahua	19 10 6	...	56 2 6	...	56 2 6
	Binohra	9 3 0	2,614 11 0	27 10 6	...	2,642 5 6
	Tiloi	...	...	35 10 0	3 4 0	38 14 0
Unao ...	Madarnagar	...	...	...	110 0 0	110 0 0
	Malauna	...	...	23 10 0	2 2 6	25 12 6
Sultánpur ...	Walipur	6 5 2	...	5 10 0	...	5 10 0
	Karwar	34 6 7	266 2 6	85 6 0	45 11 0	397 3 6
	Rámpur	169 4 0	...	154 4 0	2,327 12 3	2,482 0 3
	Khapradih	29 7 6	...	18 8 0	...	18 8 0
Partábgarh ...	Bargaon	...	...	1 14 6	167 12 9	169 11 3
	Dahyawan	...	...	9 4 9	...	9 4 9
	Total, Oudh ...	30,786 6 7	3,590 9 9	7,482 1 10	9,762 3 0	20,834 14 7
	Total, N.-W. P. & Oudh ...	45,629 9 10	5,154 0 8	10,042 4 5	13,662 12 11	28,859 2 0

(a) Paid in excess to estate and refunded by it.
(b) Rs. 524-12-5 were paid to the estate in a compromised case.

APPENDIX D.

Classification of suits, appeals and miscellaneous proceedings instituted by or against State, Municipal Boards, and Courts of Wards, during the year ending 30th September 1892.

	Total.	Decisions.								Pending.
		No.	Favourable.	No.	Unfavourable.	No.	Compromised or withdrawn.	No.		
			Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.			Rs. a. p.
Class I.—Suits arising out of relations created by contracts.										
High Court	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...		...
District Courts of Appeal ...	1	1	250 0 0	...	...	...	...	...		...
Original suits	4	3	2,767 7 6	...	...	1	90 0 0	...		...
Total ...	5	4	3,017 7 6	...	...	1	90 0 0	...		...
Class I—(a).—To recover money or property due under a contract.										
High Court	14	2	23,964 8 0	3	1,355 14 8	...	...	9		71,483 2 3
District Courts of Appeal ...	14	6	7,817 5 8	2	1,718 15 0	...	...	6		7,516 7 3
Original suits	79	38	83,586 15 0	11	63,551 4 8	7	5,553 0 11	23		44,855 6 1
Total ...	107	46	1,15,368 12 8	16	66,626 2 4	7	5,553 0 11	38		1,23,854 15 7
Class I—(b).—For damages arising from breach of contract.										
High Court	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	1		5,151 7 6
District Courts of Appeal ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...		...
Original suits	8	5	1,209 2 0	...	...	1	1,000 0 0	2		1,077 12 11
Total ...	9	5	1,209 2 0	...	...	1	1,000 0 0	3		6,229 4 5
Class I—(c).—To enforce specific performance of contract.										
High Court	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	1		44,917 0 0
District Courts of Appeal ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...		...
Original suits	3	2	4,5142 15 7		...	...	...	1		176 8 0
Total ...	4	2	45,142 15 7	...	...	...	...	2		45,093 8 0
Class II.—To recover damages on account of torts.										
High Court	4	3	2,619 8 0	...	...	...	...	1		5,798 0 0
District Courts of Appeal ...	4	..	...	1	298 7 4	1	300 0 0	2		6,051 4 0
Original suits	17	5	6,977 6 0	4	675 0 0	1	1,590 0 0	7		4,038 4 0
Total ...	25	8	9,596 14 0	5	973 7 10	2	1,890 0 0	10		15,887 8 0
Class III.—For redemption or foreclosure of property.										
High Court	2	...	...	1	185 4 0	...	...	1		7,448 15 7
District Courts of Appeal ...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	1		1,612 8 6
Original suits	4	...	...	2	5,144 5 3	...	...	2		3,978 13 8½
Total ...	7	...	...	3	5,329 9 3	...	...	4		13,040 5 9½
Class IV.—For declaration of right to, or for possession of, real property.										
High Court	26	5	16,178 12 9	4	1,56,920 11 3	1	1,308 0 0	16		4,62,729 13 1
District Courts of Appeal ...	42	14	1,714 0 1	3	4,196 2 0	...	...	25		12,597 1 6
Original suits	103	39	2,02,663 8 4	23	42,070 12 2	3	2,30,560 8 0	38		4,47,643 0 8
Total ...	171	58	2,20,556 5 2	30	2,03,187 9 5	4	2,31,868 8 0	79		9,22,969 15 3
Class V.—Suits under the Land Rent Acts.										
High Court	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...		...
District Courts of Appeal ...	6	2	284 9 10	...	...	...	...	4		1,186 1 8
Original suits	9	2	133 14 8	2	780 10 3	..	...	5		638 8 9
Total ...	15	4	418 8 6	2	780 10 3	...	...	9		1,824 10 5
Class VI.—To declare a personal right.										
High Court	1	...	...	1	510 0 0	...	...	...		...
District Courts of Appeal ...	..	...	...	...	...	...	...	...		...
Original suits	5	1	1,300 0 0	2	2,732 0 0	...	...	2		527 0 0
Total ...	6	1	1,300 0 0	2	3,242 0 0	...	...	2		527 0 0

APPENDIX D.

Classification of suits, appeals and miscellaneous proceedings instituted by or against State, Municipal Boards, and Courts of Wards, during the year ending the 30th September 1892—(concluded).

	Total.	Decisions.							No.	Pending.
		No	Favourable.	No.	Unfavourable.	No.	Compromised or withdrawn.			
Class VII.—To set aside sales by, or orders of, a Civil Court.										
			Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.			Rs. a. p.
High Court	...	...	...	...	...	...	...		...	...
District Courts of Appeal ...	3	2	112 0 0	...	...	...	...		1	5,821 8 3
Original suits	1	1	5,821 8 3	...	...	...	...		..	...
Total ...	4	3	5,933 8 3	...	...	...	..		1	5,821 8 3
Class VIII.—To set aside acts or orders passed by officers of Government.										
High Court	...	...	...	...	...	...	...		...	...
District Courts of Appeal ...	3	...	...	2	95 0 0	...	...		1	20 0 0
Original suits	8	...	...	...	...	1	100 0 0		7	1,917 0 0
Total ...	11	...	...	2	95 0 0	1	100 0 0		8	1,937 0 0
Class IX.—Compensation for land acquired for public purposes.										
High Court	1	1	10,498 13 0	...	...	...	...		...	...
District Courts of Appeal ...	3	3	134 0 6	...	...	...	...		..	...
Original suits	5	1	500 0 0	2	7,168 13 11	...	...		2	1,857 3 8½
Total ...	9	5	11,132 13 6	2	7,168 13 11	...	...		2	1,857 3 8½
Class X.—Applications for the execution of decrees.										
High Court	1	1	92 0 0	...	...	...	...		...	...
District Courts of Appeal ...	2	2	47 0 0	...	...	...	...		...	...
Original suits	110	54	31,920 4 0	12	4,418 3 10	1	104 9 6		43	75,515 11 1
Total ...	113	57	31,459 4 0	12	4,418 3 10	1	104 9 6		43	75,515 11 1
Class XI.—Suits under Act XV of 1858, XXVII of 1860, &c.										
High Court	2	2	4 0 0	...	...	...	...		...	...
District Courts of Appeal ...	1	...	...	1	123 0 0	...	..		...	...
Original suits	14	8	1,172 9 10	2	685 4 5	1	2,409 0 0		3	5,914 7 11
Total ...	17	10	1,176 9 10	3	808 4 5	1	2,409 0 0		3	5,914 7 11
Class XII.—References under Act X of 1870, Parts III and IV.										
High Court	...	...	...	...	...	...	...		...	...
District Courts of Appeal ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...		..	
Original suits	3	...	...	...	...	...	...		3	28,288 6 3
Total ...	3	...	...	...	...	...	...		3	28,288 6 3
Class XIII.—Miscellaneous.										
High Court	5	1	72,665 8 11	...	...	...	...		4	32,902 0 0
District Courts of Appeal ...	2	...	...	...	...	...	...		2	2,554 0 0
Original suits	16	7	10,343 12 0	3	2,651 10 7	3	6,234 11 3		3	1,468 12 0
Total ...	23	8	83,009 4 11	3	2,651 10 7	3	6,234 11 3		9	36,924 12 0
GRAND TOTAL ...	529	211	5,20,321 9 11	81	2,95,281 7 10	21	2,49,849 13 8		216	12,85,686 4 8

APPENDIX E.

Statement showing progress made during the year ending 30th September 1892 in realizing Government dues in pauper suits in the North-Western Provinces and Oudh.

Division.	District.	Outstanding on 1st October 1891.	Dues for the year under report.	Total.	Recovered.	Expunged.	Total.	Balance on 30th September 1892.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	N.-W. Provinces.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
MEERUT	Saháranpur ...	468 13 0	774 15 0	1,243 12 0	113 0 0	242 5 0	355 5 0	(f)888 7 0
	Muzaffarnagar ...	56 8 0	10 9 0	67 1 0	67 0 0	...	67 0 0	0 1 0
	Meerut ...	557 13 0	513 14 0	1,071 11 0	38 8 0	468 6 0	506 14 0	(g)564 13 0
	Aligarh ...	1,151 4 0	30 2 0	1,181 6 0	237 4 0	...	237 4 0	944 2 0
	Total ...	2,234 6 0	1,329 8 0	3,563 14 0	455 12 0	710 11 0	1,166 7 0	2,397 7 0
AGRA ...	Muttra ...	1,133 12 0	815 0 0	1,948 12 0	...	18 12 0	18 12 0	1,930 0 0
	Agra... ...	(a)4,712 6 0	1,510 12 6	6,223 2 6	913 10 6	2,983 11 0	3,897 5 6	2,325 13 0
	Farukhabad ...	421 12 0	1,469 14 0	1,891 10 0	297 15 0	210 6 0	508 5 0	1,383 5 0
	Etah... ...	1,088 3 9	59 8 0	1,147 11 9	20 8 0	988 13 0	1,009 5 0	138 6 9
	Mainpuri ...	(b)173 5 0	1,740 9 9	1,913 14 9	61 0 0	...	61 0 0	1,852 14 9
	Total ...	7,529 6 9	5,595 12 3	13,125 3 0	1,293 1 6	4,201 10 0	5,494 11 6	7,630 7 6
ROHILKHAND.	Bijnor ...	100 8 0	348 0 0	448 8 0	100 8 0	...	100 8 0	348 0 0
	Moradabad ...	(c)3,915 8 7	679 11 0	4,595 3 7	92 12 0	811 2 0	903 14 0	3,691 5 7
	Bareilly ...	232 6 0	356 4 0	588 10 0	65 12 0	118 14 0	184 10 0	404 0 0
	Sháhjahánpur ...	20 15 4	193 11 9	214 11 1	86 0 4	91 2 9	177 3 1	37 8 0
	Pilibhit ...	19 4 0	...	19 4 0	...	19 4 0	19 4 0	...
	Total ...	4,288 9 11	1,577 10 9	5,866 4 8	345 0 4	1,040 6 9	1,385 7 1	4,480 13 7
ALLAHABAD.	Cawnpore ...	2,257 8 0	74 4 0	2,331 12 0	7 2 0	443 4 0	450 6 0	1,881 6 0
	Fatehpur ...	242 10 0	41 3 3	283 13 3	18 0 0	44 3 3	62 3 3	221 10 0
	Allahabad ...	5,648 1 3	2,425 8 5	8,073 9 8	99 9 3	1,343 8 5	1,443 1 8	6,630 8 0
	Jhánsi ...	140 8 0	249 0 0	389 8 0	111 1 9	80 8 0	191 9 9	197 14 3
	Jalaun ...	...	150 0 0	150 0 0	...	...	...	150 0 0
	Total ...	8,288 11 3	2,939 15 8	11,228 10 11	235 13 0	1,911 7 8	2,147 4 8	9,081 6 3
BENARES	Jaunpur ...	4,572 1 0	5,069 6 4	9,641 7 4	266 15 0	3,170 6 0	3,437 5 0	6,204 2 4
	Mirzapur ...	874 14 9	302 8 0	1,177 6 9	313 15 0	696 15 0	1,010 14 0	166 8 9
	Benares ...	1,149 1 0	372 6 0	1,521 7 0	69 13 0	...	69 13 0	1,451 10 0
	Gházipur ...	664 1 6	1,498 10 6	2,162 12 0	727 6 0	...	727 6 0	1,435 6 0
	Ballia ...	274 5 3	395 0 0	669 5 3	70 2 0	295 10 0	365 12 0	303 9 3
	Total ...	7,534 7 6	7,637 14 10	15,172 6 4	1,448 3 0	4,162 15 0	5,611 2 0	9,561 4 4
KAMAON...	Garhwál ...	...	75 8 0	75 8 0	13 4 0	...	13 4 0	62 4 0
	Total ...	...	75 8 0	75 8 0	13 4 0	...	13 4 0	62 4 0
GORAKHPUR.	Gorakhpur ...	0 8 0	91 7 0	91 15 0	...	19 7 0	19 7 0	72 8 0
	Bastí ...	78 5 0	13 7 0	91 12 0	31 0 0	57 5 0	88 5 0	3 7 0
	Azamgarh ...	986 5 3	374 4 6	1,360 9 9	161 3 3	...	161 3 3	1,199 6 6
	Total ...	1,065 2 3	479 2 6	1,544 4 9	192 3 3	76 12 0	268 15 3	1,275 5 6
	Total, N.-W. P. ...	30,940 11 8	19,635 8 0	50,576 3 8	3,983 5 1	12,103 14 5	16,087 3 6	34,489 0 2
	OUDH.							
LUCKNOW.	Lucknow ...	(d)857 6 0	682 11 5	1,540 1 5	175 4 5	648 7 0	823 11 5	716 6 0
	Unao ...	98 3 9	75 4 0	173 7 9	18 0 0	155 7 9	173 7 9	...
	Ráe Bareli ...	32 6 6	155 8 0	187 14 6	117 8 0	46 2 6	163 10 6	24 4 0
	Sitapur ...	171 1 0	770 0 3	941 1 3	150 0 0	192 4 0	342 4 0	598 13 3
	Hardoi ...	...	66 6 0	66 6 0	49 12 0	...	49 12 0	16 10 0
	Total ...	1,159 1 3	1,749 13 8	2,908 14 11	510 8 5	1,042 5 3	1,552 13 8	1,356 1 3
FYZABAD	Fyzabad ...	930 1 3	205 15 1	1,196 0 4	47 2 0	947 11 7	994 13 7	201 2 9
	Bahraich ...	(e)90 3 9	2,963 6 3	3,053 10 0	116 8 3	8 7 0	124 15 3	2,928 10 9
	Gonda ...	920 0 9	229 2 0	1,149 2 9	52 14 3	135 10 9	188 9 0	960 9 9
	Bara Banki ...	37 8 0	604 8 0	642 0 0	64 8 0	550 0 0	614 8 0	27 8 0
	Sultánpur ...	1,510 13 3	215 0 6	1,725 13 9	277 4 0	1,349 4 0	1,626 8 0	99 5 9
	Partábgarh ...	256 6 3	...	256 6 3	...	17 5 0	17 5 0	239 1 3
	Total ...	3,745 1 3	4,277 15 10	8,023 1 1	558 4 6	3,008 6 4	3,566 10 10	4,456 6 3
	Total, Oudh ...	4,904 2 6	6,027 13 6	10,932 0 0	1,068 12 11	4,050 11 7	5,119 8 6	5,812 7 6
	Total, N.-W. P. and Oudh. ...	35,844 14 2	25,663 5 6	61,508 3 8	5,052 2 0	16,154 10 0	21,206 12 0	40,301 7 8

(a) Rupees 265-8-0 were wrongly included by Collector last year.
(b) Collector says Rs. 0-8-0 were wrongly included last year.
(c) Collector reports last year's balance as incorrect.
(d) Deputy Commissioner says the difference Rs. 0-12-0 is due to an item of Rs. 45 being entered for Rs. 45-12-0.
(e) Collector reports that Rs. 8-0-0 were wrongly included last year.
(f) The actual balance is Rs. 720-15-0; Rs. 167-8-0 being re-transferred to Meerut to which district the case originally belonged.
(g) Collector reports Rs. 28-8-0 as wrongly included last year; the actual balance is Rs. 536-5-0.

ORDERS OF GOVERNMENT.

No. $\frac{325}{\text{VII—539B}}$ OF 1893.

FROM

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

N.-W. PROVINCES AND OUDH,

TO

THE LEGAL REMEMBRANCER TO GOVERNMENT,

N.-W. PROVINCES AND OUDH.

DATED NAINI TAL, THE 28TH APRIL 1893.

SIR,

JUDICIAL DEPT. (CIVIL).

I AM directed to acknowledge the receipt of Mr. Thornton's No. $\frac{2262}{568}$, dated 15th March 1893, being the report on the civil litigation to which the Secretary of State, Municipal Boards and Courts of Wards were parties during the year ending 30th September 1892. In examining and comparing the returns submitted with the report and gauging the result of the year's litigation some little difficulty has been experienced in connection with two matters which were noticed in last year's review as materially influencing the statistics, *viz.*, the effect of compromises and withdrawals, and the extent of the miscellaneous proceedings under the Land Acquisition Act. For instance in the case of the Bhatpura Estate the value of the three claims decided amounted to Rs. 3,790, of which two were decided against the estate and one compromised: if the compromised suit (the value of which is not stated) was of small value, the want of success in establishing two large claims would be noticeable, or *vice versâ*. Again, references under the Land Acquisition Act form a large proportion of the suits entered in Appendix A, but it is impossible at present to distinguish them, with the amounts involved, from civil suits proper. I am to request therefore that in future the value of suits compromised or withdrawn may be shown in a foot-note to the appendix concerned; and that in the same way the sums entered in the columns headed "value of claim" and "amount decreed" which refer to transactions under the Land Acquisition Act may be distinguished from the items which relate to regular suits.

2. *State litigation.*—Deducting cases pending and withdrawn, claims to the value of Rs. 25,715 were made by the State in Courts of first instance, of which Rs. 11,168, or 43·4 per cent. only, were decreed: the comparatively small percentage of success is shown by the returns to be due to failure to substantiate claims aggregating Rs. 14,536 in value in five cases in the districts of Saháranpur, Muttra, Agra, Sháhjahánpur and Mirzapur. It is gathered however from the remarks in paragraph 8 of the report that of these cases four consisted of references to Judges under the Land Acquisition Act, while one was a miscellaneous application. If such transactions are set aside, the litigation undertaken by the State as plaintiff during the year and

brought to termination appears to have been trifling. With the exception of two forest cases in Bijnor and Gorakhpur, the decisions in which were instrumental in raising the percentage of claims decreed against the Government to 16·4, the litigation in which the State was involved as defendant was equally insignificant. The litigation in appellate courts chiefly consisted in defending appeals presented by private persons: of 14 such appeals disposed of, one only was decided adversely to the State. Of five appeals presented by the State and disposed of, the State was unsuccessful in no less than three, the adverse decision in the most important case being apparently due to neglect to report to the Legal Remembrancer the death of the plaintiff-respondent. It is presumed that action has been taken to prevent the occurrence of such mistakes in future.

The statement of the realisation of amounts decreed in favour of the State is not, on the face of it, satisfactory, showing a recovery of 10 per cent. only (Rs. 2,282) of the demands, Rs. 22,635, as compared with 23 per cent. in the previous year: it is explained however that the short collections are due to the existence of bad debts carried on from previous years. In Oudh the collections during the year were especially bad, Rs. 32 out of Rs. 2,249, or 1·4 per cent.; but the large sum due in Kheri was subsequently realised. It has been ascertained since the close of the year that the item of Rs. 8,298 shown as outstanding against the Sahíranpur District should be written off, the amount due having been realised from the judgment-debtor in England.

3. *Municipal litigation.*—Of municipalities Benares seems to be the most litigious, having 14 original suits and appeals on hand. As a rule the administration of the municipalities is carried on without resort to the law courts, and the municipal litigation disposed of by the courts during the year amounted only to 14 suits in all, of which nine were decided in favour of, and five against, the municipalities concerned. Oudh municipalities are again represented in the returns after an interval of two years. It is observed that cases still continue to occur in which municipalities fail to entrust the conduct of suits to the Legal Remembrancer; and in three out of the five unsuccessful cases noted above the municipalities acted as their own advisers.

4. *Courts of Wards' litigation.*—The litigation to which the Courts of Wards were parties is the most important of the three branches of the Legal Remembrancer's work now reported on. The record is not altogether satisfactory. It stands as follows for original suits, omitting, so far as possible, the figures relating to compromises:—

Court of Wards Plaintiff.

	Total number disposed of.	In favour of Courts of Wards.	Total value of claims.	Amount decreed.
			Rs.	Rs.
North-Western Provinces ...	19	17, or 89·4 per cent.	74,933	18,809, or 25·1 per cent.
Oudh	94	74, or 78·7 per cent.	58,621	46,102, or 78·6 per cent.
Total ...	113	91, or 80·5 per cent.	1,33,554	64,911, or 48·6 per cent.

Court of Wards Defendant.

	Total number disposed of.	In favour of Courts of Wards.	Total value of claims.	Amount decreed.
			Rs.	Rs.
North-Western Provinces ...	17	7, or 41·1 per cent.	24,092	12,098, or 50·2 per cent
Oudh	41	28, or 68·3 per cent	2,59,932	70,266, or 27 per cent
Total ...	58	35, or 60·3 per cent.	2,84,024	82,364, or 29 per. cent.

In examining the returns it must apparently be borne in mind that the amount shown as decreed in a case may be altogether disproportionate to the value of the claim, although the claim may have been entirely substantiated. Thus out of Rs. 44,974 shown as the value of the claim in the case of the Mashuk Mahal Begum Estate *versus* Shib Lal and others (Bareilly) only Rs. 8,566 are returned as decreed, though the entire claim, which included a demand for delivery of a village, is said (*vide* paragraph 29 of the report) to have been actually decreed. It follows that in suits in which the Court of Wards was plaintiff a small proportion of sums decreed, as in the North-Western Provinces in the past year, is not incompatible with a fair measure of success in the Courts: the statistics by themselves are not a reliable test. Another misleading feature of the returns is alluded to at the end of paragraph 29 of the report. I am to ask if steps cannot be taken to secure uniformity in the returns and to eliminate the uncertainty which at present prevails.

5. The most noticeable failure in suits in which the Court of Wards was plaintiff is that of the Siklri Chand Estate (Gorakhpur) *versus* Sant Sahai Rasth, in which the Court failed to prove claims amounting to Rs. 15,821 in value. Several large estates in Oudh, the affairs of which had been taken over by the Court of Wards in a state of general disorder, due in great part to the doubtful money-lending transactions of their owners, monopolised the greater part of the litigation in that province. Without thoroughly reliable accounts successful results cannot always be ensured, and the failures during the year under report are somewhat numerous: more especially in the North-Western Provinces, where ten suits in which the Court was defendant were lost to seven gained. Many of the important adverse decisions are however under appeal. In District Courts of appeal the Courts of Wards were successful in 18 out of 22 cases; in the superior appellate courts on the other hand out of 16 cases only nine were decided in their favour: a result which cannot be regarded as satisfactory. In Oudh substantial progress was made in the realisation of the demands, the collections, Rs. 30,262, amounting to 40 per cent. of the total sum due, Rs. 74,400: in the North-Western Provinces the recoverable balance on the books at the close of the year was very large, Rs. 65,352, and the collections during the year Rs. 14,843 out of Rs. 89,410, or 16·6 per cent., compare unfavourably with those of the previous year, when 23 per cent. were collected.

6. The collections under every head are compared with those of the previous year in the following table:—

	Total demand.	Realised during 1891-92.	Percentage realised in 1891-92.	Percentage realised in 1890-91.
State.	Rs.	Rs.		
North-Western Provinces	20,387	2,250	11·0	24·3
Oudh	2,249	32	1·4	5·5
Total ...	22,636	2,282	10·0	23·0
Municipalities.				
North-Western Provinces	3,326	355	10·6	8·0
Oudh	...	...	...	...
Total ...	3,326	355	10·6	8·0
Courts of Wards.				
North-Western Provinces	89,410	14,843	16·6	23·6
Oudh	74,400	30,262	40·6	24·4
Total ...	1,63,810	45,105	27·5	24·0
GRAND TOTAL ...	1,89,772	47,742	25·1	23·6

On the whole there was improvement, which was counterbalanced however by a considerable decrease in the proportion of sums realised in pauper suits, 8 per cent. as compared with 13 per cent. in the previous year.

7. In order to secure as Government pleaders to a greater extent than at present practitioners of ability and professional standing, the scale of remuneration for Government pleaders in criminal cases was considerably raised in June 1892 by Resolution No. $\frac{478}{\text{VII}-241\text{B}}$, dated 7th June 1892; and in January 1893 a Standing Counsel was appointed whose special business it is to represent the Government and the Court of Wards, North-Western Provinces, in the High Court, and to give advice in connection with litigation to the Government and to the Courts of Wards in both provinces. It is hoped that these measures may result in increased efficiency in the conduct of those suits which it may be found necessary after careful consideration of the circumstances of the case to institute or defend.

I have the honor to be,

SIR,

Your most obedient servant,

W. H. L. IMPEY,

Secy. to Govt., N.-W. P. and Oudh.